THE CENTRAL QUESTION OF MARK'S GOSPEL: A STUDY OF MARK 8:29

A dissertation by

Harry T. Fleddermann

presented to

The Faculty of the

Graduate Theological Union

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Berkeley, California

May, 1978

Committee Signatures:

Thomas W. Leahy
Coordinator

Frederick H. Borsch

Herman C. Waetjen

Willis Barnstone

David Roland Gold

UMI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

Chapter

I THE MESSIANIC SECRET 11

Commands to Silence Addressed to Demons
Commands to Silence After Miracles
Mark's Parable Theory
Lack of Understanding of the Disciples
The Discipleship Section
The Jerusalem Section
The Passion

II CHRIST 75

Jewish Messianism
Christian Messianism
Christ in Mark
The Son of David
Christ in the Trial
The King of the Jews

III SON OF GOD 106

Jewish Background
The Baptism of Jesus
The Demons' Cries
The Transfiguration
The Parable of the Wicked Tenants
The Time of the End
Gethsemane
The Trial
The Centurion's Confession

IV SON OF MAN 137

Apocalyptic Background
The Son of Man on Earth
The First Passion Prediction
The Son of Man's Coming
Further Passion Predictions
The Parousia of the Son of Man
The Passion
The Trial

V CONFESSION AND TRIAL 177

Peter's Confession
The Sanhedrin Trial

CONCLUSION 206

BIBLIOGRAPHY 211

UMI

INTRODUCTION

The understanding of Mark's gospel has been advanced in the last two hundred years by three waves of synoptic criticism. Beginning in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, literary source criticism, responding to the synoptic problem attempted to clarify the relationships between the three gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. The first attempts postulated an original oral gospel or an Aramaic primal gospel which all three synoptic authors used independently. The decisive breakthrough came in the mid-nineteenth century with the discovery by Karl Lachmann ("De ordine narrationum in evangeliis synopticis," 1835) that Matthew and Luke agree in order only insofar as they agree with Mark. This argument from order established the priority of Mark. Mark was the first written gospel, and Matthew and Luke both used Mark in writing their own gospels. In addition Christian Hermann Weisse (Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet, 1838) drew attention to the fact that Matthew and Luke shared much material, mostly sayings, not found in Mark. To account for this material he postulated a sayings source, This led to the two-source theory of synoptic literary relationships: Matthew and Luke used two main sources, the gospel of Mark and a sayings source Q, in the composition of their gospels.[1]

---

[1]Werner Georg Kümmel, The New Testament: The History

At the heart of the two-source theory was the priority of Mark. The assumption was then made that since Mark is the earliest gospel it stands closest to the events that are narrated and is in fact an historical account of the events of Jesus' life and death. All that was necessary was to eliminate the blatantly mythical elements from Mark's account and the result would be a firm historical outline of the life of Jesus. William Wrede cut the ground from under the feet of those who saw in Mark's gospel an essentially historical document.[1] He showed that the gospel is dominated from beginning to end by a complex theological idea, the messianic secret. This idea so colors Mark's narrative that it is impossible to reconstruct an historical account from the gospel. Mark's gospel belongs not to history but to the history of dogma.[2]

The second wave of synoptic criticism, form criticism, followed World War I. Form criticism attempted to reach beyond the written gospels into the period of oral tradition that preceded them. Initially there were no extended compositions, but only small units, individual stories, sayings, parables. These individual units fit into several categories or forms like the miracle story or the controversy story.

---

of the Investigation of Its Problems, trans. S. McLean Gilmour and Howard C. Kee (Nashville and New York: Abingdon, 1972), pp. 74-88, 144-61.

[1]William Wrede, Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien: Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901); English translation: The Messianic Secret, trans. J. C. G. Greig (Greenwood, S.C.: Attic, 1971).

[2]Wrede, Secret, p. 131.

These forms in many cases have non-Christian parallels and well-defined component parts that recur with regularity in unit after unit. In the oral tradition these forms responded to the needs in the community, the need for apologetic material, for example, or the need for exemplary material for sermons. As the tradition developed, some of these small units were gathered into collections. In particular the need was felt early for a connected account of the passion. The evangelists collected the small pericopes and the larger units and joined them into a continuous narrative.[1] Karl Ludwig Schmidt studied the gospel framework and showed that the temporal and geographical notices and the summaries that generalize and provide an illusion of a continuous narrative are secondary.[2] Martin Dibelius and Rudolf Bultmann analyzed the individual units, identified and described the underlying forms, and attempted to write a history of the development of the tradition beginning from the original Sitz im Leben that gave rise to the forms up to the final collection in the written gospels.[3] The form critics concentrated on the traditional

---

[1]Joachim Rohde, Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists, trans. Dorothea M. Barton (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968), pp. 4-5.

[2]Karl Ludwig Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung (Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1919).

[3]Martin Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1919); English translation: From Tradition to Gospel, trans. Bertram Lee Woolf (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.). Rudolf Bultmann, Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921); English translation: The History of the Synoptic Tradition, trans. John Marsh (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1963).

units and tended to minimize the role of the evangelists in the formation of the written gospels. The often quoted words of Dibelius and Bultmann on this point leave no doubt. Dibelius writes, "The authors of the Gospels, at least of the synoptics are not 'authors' in the literary sense, but collectors."[1] Bultmann claims that "Mark is not sufficiently master of his material to be able to venture on a systematic construction himself."[2]

The pendulum was bound to swing back. After World War II the third wave of synoptic criticism, redaction criticism, began to concentrate attention on the work of the final redactors of the synoptic gospels. The new movement was set in motion by three books, one on each of the synoptic gospels.[3] The final redactors were no longer considered mere collectors of the tradition, but they were studied as authors in their own right. The results of form criticism were taken as the starting point. The evangelists incorporated the small units into their works. In doing this they selected, assembled, and structured the small units; they modified and rewrote some of them; and they created new material. Redaction criticism

---

[1]Dibelius, Tradition, p. 59.

[2]Bultmann, History, p. 350.

[3]Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, trans. Percy Scott (London: SCM, 1963); Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper and Row, 1961); Willi Marxsen, Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel, trans. James Boyce, Donald Juel, William Poehlmann with Roy A. Harrisville (New York: Abingdon, 1969).

attempts to study this whole process and to uncover the theological motivation that lies behind it.[1] The purpose is not so much to try to get into the author's mind as to clarify the theological, literary statement he is making in his work.[2]

Redaction criticism is the methodology that will be used in this dissertation. Redaction criticism of Mark's gospel is much more difficult to pursue than redaction criticism of the gospels of Matthew and Luke. In the case of Matthew and Luke we have one of the sources they used, Mark's gospel, and we can reconstruct with some success the sayings source Q that they both also used. It is possible to compare Matthew's or Luke's handling of a pericope that they took over from Mark with the original pericope in Mark's gospel. It is then easy to separate tradition and redaction and to gain

---

[1] Heinrich Zimmermann, Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre: Darstellung der historisch-kritischen Methode, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Kath. Bibelwerk, 1968), pp. 221-30; Norman Perrin, What is Redaction Criticism? (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), p. 1.

[2] The development of new methodologies for the study of the synoptic texts is an ongoing task. Some new approaches are through literary criticism, rhetorical analysis, structuralism, semiotics, and generative poetics. See, for example, William A. Beardslee, Literary Criticism of the New Testament (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970); Amos N. Wilder, Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel (London: SCM, 1964); Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, "Elements of an Exegesis of the Gospel of Mark According to Lévi-Strauss' Methodology," Society of Biblical Literature 1977 Seminar Papers, ed. Paul J. Achtemeier (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977), pp. 155-70; Susan Wittig, "Meaning and Modes of Signification: Toward a Semiotic of the Parable," Semiology and Parables: An Exploration of the Possibilities Offered by Structuralism for Exegesis, Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series, vol. 9, ed. Daniel Patte (Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1976), pp. 319-47; Erhard Güttgemanns, "What is 'Generative Poetics'? Theses and Reflections Concerning a New Exegetical Method," Semeia 6 (1976): 1-21.

some insight into the way Matthew and Luke work and to discover some of their concerns and motivation.[1] The redaction criticism of Mark's gospel labors under the severe handicap that we do not have before us the sources that Mark used, with one possible exception. For the most part, the sources have to be recovered from Mark's text. This is a difficult procedure, and the results are usually tentative. The one possible exception is Q. The relationship of Mark and Q is a leftover problem from source criticism that has never been solved. The least that can be said is that Mark knew and used elements from the Q tradition. He may or may not have used the written Q.[2] The problem can only be solved by careful exegesis of the passages where there appears to be contact between Mark and Q.

---

[1]Redaction criticism presupposes the validity of the two-source theory of synoptic literary relationships. For a summary of the arguments that support the theory, see Werner Georg Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, trans. A. J. Mattill, Jr. (London: SCM, 1966), pp. 43-60. The validity of the two-source theory is presupposed in this dissertation. A caution, however, is necessary. The interrelationships of the three synoptic gospels is a complex problem. In a given case, Matthew, for example, may preserve a more primitive tradition than Mark. Each text must be approached individually. The matter is so complicated that it is little wonder that the two-source theory has not been able to satisfy everyone, although the majority of scholars accept it as a working hypothesis. For dissenting views, see, for example, William R. Farmer, The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis (New York: Macmillan, 1964); P. Benoit and M.-E. Boismard, Synopse des évangiles en Francais, vol. 2 (Paris: Cerf, 1972).

[2]For a survey of this problem, see M. Devisch, "La relation entre l'évangile de Marc et le document Q," L'évangile selon Marc: Tradition et rédaction, Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium, vol. 34, ed. M. Sabbe (Louvain: Leuven University, 1974), pp. 59-91; M. Eugene Boring, "The Paucity of Sayings in Mark: A Hypothesis," Society of Biblical Literature 1977 Seminar Papers, ed. Paul J. Achtemeier (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977), pp. 371-77.

Even if this problem were solved, it would only be of limited assistance as the vast majority of Markan passages do not have a Q parallel. The tools used in redaction criticism of Mark's gospel are vocabulary studies, style criticism, and form criticism. In most cases these tools can only distinguish between tradition and redaction with greater or lesser degrees of probability and the decision must be made on the basis of the content of the passage. This involves a necessarily circular argument. It is only by the analysis of individual passages that we can discover what is typically Markan theology or a Markan concern. Once we have some understanding of what Mark is doing, then we can use this to help decide Markan redaction when vocabulary and style are inconclusive. The entire procedure may appear to be too hypothetical and conjectural to achieve any solid results. The ultimate vindication of the method is the undeniable fact that redaction criticism has furthered our understanding of Mark's gospel and developed insights that could not be reached without it. In the end this is all that can be asked of any method.[1]

This dissertation will seek to show that the heart of

---

[1]The strength and the richness of redaction criticism have been dramatized by its ability to come to grips with such a difficult passage as Mark's eschatological discourse (13:1-37). Two of the finest redaction critics, Jan Lambrecht and Rudolf Pesch, have approached the text from different perspectives. As a result of their work we are in a much better position to understand what Mark is saying. See Jan Lambrecht, Die Redaktion der Markus-Apokalypse: Literarische Analyse und Strukturuntersuchung, Analecta biblica, vol. 28 (Rome: Päpstliches Bibelinstitut, 1967); Rudolf Pesch, Naherwartungen: Tradition und Redaktion in Mk 13 (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1968).

Mark's gospel is Jesus' question to the disciples in 8:29, "But you, who do you say I am?" The pericope of Caesarea Philippi (8:27-9:1) has always been important in the exegesis of Mark's gospel. In the days of the Markan hypothesis when the gospel was thought to provide a sketch of the history of Jesus, Caesarea Philippi marked a turning point in Jesus' ministry, and Wrede in his attack on this hypothesis found it necessary to discuss the passage in detail.[1] The passage was something of an embarrassment to the form critics, and Bultmann admits rather reluctantly that here at least Mark himself is at work.[2] Nor has the passage escaped the notice of the redaction critics. The relatively young discipline has already produced several short studies on the pericope,[3] and there has been one monograph on the subject, Maria Horstmann's Studien zur markinischen Christologie.[4] Like the majority of exegetes, Horstmann sees 8:27 as the dividing point in Mark's gospel.[5]

---

[1]Wrede, Secret, pp. 115-24, 238-41.

[2]Bultmann, History, p. 350.

[3]Ernst Haenchen, "Die Komposition von Mk viii 27-ix 1 und Par.," NT 6 (1963): 81-109; A. Denaux, "Petrusbelijdenis en eerste lijdensvoorspelling," Collationes brugenses et gandavenses 15 (1969): 188-220; Perrin, Redaction Criticism, pp. 40-56; Rudolf Pesch, "Das Messiasbekenntnis des Petrus (Mk 8,27-30): Neuverhandlung einer alten Frage," BZ 17 (1973): 178-95, 18 (1974): 20-31.

[4]Maria Horstmann, Studien zur markinischen Christologie: Mk 8,27-9,13 als Zugang zum Christusbild des zweiten Evangeliums, Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, n.s., vol. 6, 2nd ed. (Münster: Aschendorff, 1973).

[5]Horstmann, pp. 2-4; I. de la Potterie, "De compositione evangelii Marci," Verbum domini 44 (1966): 135-41; Pesch, Naherwartungen, pp. 50-53.

Here in the Caesarea Philippi pericope two important lines of Mark's gospel cross, the narrative of Jesus' ministry portrayed under the "way" motif and the passion and resurrection kerygma concentrated in the passion predication.[1] Horstmann's exegesis of the pericope is, in general, excellent; and her work has been justly praised.[2] The present study is indebted to it for many helpful insights. The work, however, has several limitations. Horstmann tends to underestimate the extent of Mark's redaction in the Caesarea Philippi pericope; she relies too heavily on Wrede in her understanding of the messianic secret; and she does not succeed in capturing the specifically Markan nuances of the titles "Christ" and "Son of Man." The passage is so important for understanding Mark's gospel that a new redaction-critical study is justified.

Jesus' question to the disciples in 8:29 is related to several important themes in Mark's gospel. Jesus responds to Peter's answer to his question with a command to silence (8:30). This places the question within the framework of the messianic secret. We will follow this theme through Mark (Chapter I). Peter answers Jesus' question with the confession, "You are the Christ" (8:29). This confession is somewhat unexpected as this is the first occurrence of the title since the opening verse of the gospel. To understand the question and this response to it we must find out what Mark means by

---

[1] 8:27, 31. See Horstmann, p. 2.

[2] Howard C. Kee, "Mark as Redactor and Theologian: A Survey of Some Recent Markan Studies," JBL 90 (1971): 335.

the title "Christ" (Chapter II). Closely connected with the title "Christ" in Mark is the title "Son of God." Although it appears only indirectly in the Caesarea Philippi pericope (8:38), it stands at the climax of the immediately following pericope of the Transfiguration (9:7). It is in apposition to the title "Christ" in the high priest's question in 14:61. To understand Peter's confession we must uncover the meaning of Son of God in Mark (Chapter III). Immediately after the command to silence Jesus begins to teach the disciples that the Son of Man must suffer (8:31). The Son of Man theme is thus closely related to Jesus' question; it also will be followed through Mark's gospel (Chapter IV). The titles "Christ," "Son of God," and "Son of Man" contain important aspects of Mark's understanding of Jesus. In exploring their meaning in the gospel we will be studying the extent to which Mark is seeking to answer the question, "But you, who do you say I am?" Finally, the Caesarea Philippi pericope (8:27-9:1) will be analyzed along with the pericope of the trial before the Sanhedrin (14:55-65) which also deals with the question who Jesus is (Chapter V).

CHAPTER I

THE MESSIANIC SECRET

William Wrede revolutionized the study of Mark's gospel by isolating the data of the messianic secret. There is a tension in Mark between revelation and concealment. The demons know who Jesus is and are forbidden to speak. Jesus also imposes silence after his miracles. In contrast to the crowds who are taught in unintelligible riddles, the disciples are given special instructions. Yet even they do not understand. Although Wrede isolated the data, his interpretation of it has not been accepted. He saw the secret as an attempt within the early tradition, which was later developed by Mark, to smooth over the transition from an original belief in which Jesus became Messiah at the resurrection to a later view in which messiahship was projected back into his earthly life. The secret held the two views together: Jesus was Messiah during his ministry but this was concealed. Wrede then concluded that the historical Jesus did not claim to be Messiah.[1]

Wrede was driven by a desire to reconstruct the theological history of the early church.[2] Unfortunately, he did not have the benefit of the later developments of form criticism

---

[1] Wrede, Secret, pp. 229-30.

[2] Georg Strecker, "William Wrede," ZTK 57 (1960): 67-91.

and redaction criticism, and he was not able to distinguish sufficiently between the pre-Markan tradition and Mark's own view. As a result, he erroneously situated the secrecy motif in the pre-Markan tradition. Wrede also fell into his own trap. He was primarily interested in destroying past psychologizing attempts to write a life of Jesus using Mark as a base. But then he succumbed to the fallacy he was combatting when he attempted to draw an historical conclusion from his literary study.[1]

Although Wrede's interpretation of the messianic secret has not been accepted, neither has the discussion come to rest. Therefore a new analysis of the material is justified. Mark establishes the messianic secret in the first half of the gospel (1:1-8:26) by introducing commands to silence both to the demons and to those who witness the miracles, by stating his parable theory, and by developing the theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples. We will investigate these motifs first; then we will study the development of the messianic secret in the second half of the gospel (8:27-16:8), following Mark's treatment through the discipleship section (8:27-10:52), the Jerusalem section (11:1-13:37), and the passion (14:1-16:8).

Commands to Silence Addressed to Demons

After an introduction which culminates in Jesus'

---

[1]Hans Jürgen Ebeling, Das Messiasgeheimnis und die Botschaft des Marcus-Evangelisten, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, vol. 19 (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1939), p. 12.

baptism and temptation (1:1-13), a summary of Jesus' preaching (1:14-15), and the call of the first four disciples (1:16-20), Mark opens the public ministry of Jesus with a day of powerful action in Capernaum (1:21-34). His first appearance is in the synagogue where he teaches and expels an unclean spirit. The spirit cries out: "What have you to do with us, Jesus the Nazarene? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are, the Holy One of God" (1:24). In v. 24a the spirit is using an apotropaic formula derived from 1 Kgs 17:18 LXX to counter the power of Jesus.[1] The use of Jesus' name, the statement that the demon knows who Jesus is, and the further naming of him as "the Holy One of God" are also magical weapons which the demon uses to try to ward off the power of Jesus.[2] Jesus silences the demon, "Be silent[3] and come out of him!" (1:25). In the traditional[4] story this silencing would be Jesus'

---

[1]Otto Bauernfeind, Die Worte der Dämonen im Markusevangelium, Beitrage zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, series 3, col. 8 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1927), pp. 3-13; T. A. Burkill, Mysterious Revelation: An Examination of the Philosophy of St. Mark's Gospel (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, 1963), pp. 76-78; Rudolf Pesch, "Ein Tag vollmächtigen Wirkens Jesu in Kapharnaum (Mk 1,21-34. 35-39," Bibel und Leben 9 (1968): 120.

[2]Bauernfeind, pp. 13-18; Burkill, Revelation, pp. 73-78; Pesch, "Tag," pp. 120-21.

[3]Literally: "Be muzzled!" See William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1957), p. 869.

[4]The word "traditional" in this dissertation refers to the pre-Markan sayings and narrative material. Some of these narratives may contain historical facts and some of the sayings may be authentic words of Jesus. In general, questions of historicity are beyond the scope of this dissertation. The word "redactional" refers to material Mark himself composed.

counterattack to the demon's magical efforts to bring him under control or to disarm him. The command to silence negates the demon's magical attempt to use Jesus' name to gain control over him. The exorcist and the demon are locked in a battle to control one another.[1] The command to silence is thus a motif in the traditional exorcism story. Mark's understanding of the command, though, is different. It is brought out clearly in two summaries of Jesus' activity.

In a summary (1:32-34) that closes the day in Capernaum, the whole city gathers at the door of Simon's house. Jesus cures many and drives out many demons. The passage concludes: "And he did not permit the demons to speak because they knew him" (1:34cd). This verse is redactional.[2] The verb λαλέω occurs mostly in redactional passages.[3] Mark uses δαιμόνια redactionally in 1:39; 3:15; and 6:13.[4] But the content of the verse more than the vocabulary points to Mark. It is

---

[1]Bauernfeind, pp. 29-34.

[2]The entire summary may be redactional. See Thierry Snoy, "Les miracles dans l'évangile de Marc: Examen de quelques études récentes," RTL 4 (1973): 59-72. Pesch, Kertelge, and Egger try to reconstruct a traditional text that Mark has redacted, but they consider v. 34cd to be redactional. See Pesch, "Tag," pp. 186-95; Karl Kertelge, Die Wunder Jesu im Markusevangelium: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung, Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, vol. 23 (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1970), pp. 31-33; Wilhelm Egger, Frohbotschaft und Lehre: Die Sammelberichte des Wirkens Jesu im Markusevangelium, Frankfurter theologische Studien, vol. 19 (Frankfurt: Josef Knecht, 1976), pp. 64-73.

[3]1:34; 2:2; 4:33, 34, 5:35, 36; 8:32; 12:1; 14:9, 31, 43. See Ludger Schenke, Studien zur Passionsgeschichte des Markus: Tradition und Redaktion in Markus 14,1-42, Forschung zur Bibel, vol. 4 (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1971), p. 419.

[4]Snoy, "Miracles," pp. 60-63.

Mark who combined the exorcism in the synagogue and the cure of Simon's mother-in-law.[1] So, too, it is Mark who generalizes here. This verse refers back to the exorcism in the synagogue, picking up the demon's "I know who you are" (1:24). The imperfect raises the individual command to the level of a permanent prohibition.[2] The ὅτι is causal.[3] The demons are not silenced because what they are saying is false or because their witness as unclean spirits is not acceptable. They are silenced because they know Jesus. Of course, Mark will not have considered the demons as worthy to confess Jesus, but this is not his point here. He is concerned to silence any disclosure of who Jesus is, not just a demonic disclosure. The command in 8:30 shows this decisively.[4] This summary lets us see how Mark understood the command in 1:25. For Mark it is not the magical counter-attack of the exorcist; it is part of the messianic secret.[5] Jesus does not want who he is revealed. The title "the Holy One of God" says something about Jesus' person, and it is this

---

[1]Pesch, "Tag," pp. 275-76.

[2]Burkill, Revelation, pp. 64-66; Pesch, "Tag," p. 190; Snoy, "Miracles," p. 63.

[3]Pesch, "Tag," p. 190.

[4]Wrede, Secret, p. 39; Ulrich Luz, "Das Geheimnismotif und die markinische Christologie," ZNW 56 (1965): 20, 23.

[5]Erik Sjöberg, Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien, Acta Reg. Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis, vol. 53 (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1955), p. 110; Burkill, Revelation, p. 71; Georg Strecker, "Zur Messiasgeheimnistheorie im Markusevangelium," Studia Evangelica, vol. 3, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, vol. 88, ed. F. L. Cross (Berlin: Akademie, 1964), p. 90; Kertelge, Wunder, pp. 32-33; Horstmann, p. 119.

that cannot be spoken.[1] This is the messianic secret.

The fact that Jesus silences the demon after it has cried out points to the revelatory aspect of the messianic secret. It is true that Mark understands that the people in the synagogue do not hear what the demon says. They do not react at all to the title "the Holy One of God."[2] But Mark's readers do hear. In fact this is the central point of the story. The story reveals Jesus as "the Holy One of God." It is as "the Holy One of God" that he is able to expel the demon. That Jesus as "the Holy One of God" has this power is the Christological point of the narrative. The command to silence is a literary device that enables Mark to communicate information to his readers.[3] However, this must be properly understood. For Ebeling the command is just a literary technique which is intended to highlight the revelation. Despite Jesus' efforts to remain hidden, the revelation of who he is breaks through inevitably. The revelation is so strong that it cannot be contained.[4] However, this does not accurately

---

[1]The title is found only here, in the parallel passage Luke 4:34, and in John 6:69. Compare Acts 2:27, 4:27; 13:35. On the title see Eduard Schweizer, "'Er wird Nazoräer heissen,' zu Mc. 1,24; Mt. 2,23," Neotestamentica: German and English Essays 1951-1963 (Zürich and Stuttgart: Zwingli, 1963), pp. 51-55.

[2]Wrede, Secret, p. 133; Sjöberg, Der verborgene Menschensohn, p. 110; Burkill, Revelation, pp. 71-72; Mark Errol Glasswell, "The Use of Miracles in the Markan Gospel," Miracles: Cambridge Studies in their Philosophy and History, ed. C. F. D. Moule (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1965), p. 155.

[3]G. Minette de Tillesse, Le secret messianique dans l'Evangile de Marc, Lectio Divina, vol. 47 (Paris: Cerf, 1968), p. 82.

[4]Ebeling, pp. 121-23, 129-31.

describe Mark's purpose. Mark is not concerned to highlight the revelation but to qualify it. As soon as he reveals something about Jesus' person, he feels he must take back the revelation, suppress it, restrict it, negate it. The revelation is secret.[1]

The second summary passage (3:7-12) is equally clear. The summary contrasts the excitement caused by Jesus and his desire to remain hidden. The crowds stream to Jesus, but he withdraws, even having a boat readied so that he can escape the crush of the crowd. The last two verses describe the silencing of the demons when they cry out, "You are the Son of God." These two verses (vv. 11-12) are redactional.[2] In v. 11 we find a common Markan designation for the demons πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον[3] and the word ὅταν which Mark uses frequently

---

[1]Karl-Georg Reploh, Markus--Lehrer der Gemeinde: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Jüngerperikopen des Markus-Evangeliums, Stuttgarter biblische Monographien, vol. 9, (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1969), p. 41.

[2]The entire summary is probably redactional. See T. A. Burkill, "Mark 3:7-12 and the Alleged Dualism in the Evangelist's Miracle Material," JBL 87 (1968): 409-417; Wilhelm Egger, "Die Verborgenheit Jesu in Mk 3,7-12," Biblica 50 (1969): 466-90; idem, Frohbotschaft, pp. 91-111; Snoy, "Miracles," 4 (1973): 73-95. Keck tries to isolate a traditional summary but even he admits that vv. 11-12 are redactional. See Leander E. Keck, "Mark 3:7-12 and Mark's Christology," JBL 84 (1965): 341-58.

[3]1:23, 26, 27; 3:11, 30; 5:2, 8, 13; 6:7; 7:25; 9:25. Pesch maintains that all occurrences of πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον in Mark are traditional. See Rudolf Pesch, "'Eine neue Lehre aus Macht': Eine Studie zu Mk 1,21-28," Evangelieforschung: Ausgewählte Aufsätze deutscher Exegeten, ed. Johannes B. Bauer (Graz, Vienna, Cologne: Styria, 1968), p. 251; idem, "Tag," p. 189, n. 37. The expression is redactional here and at 3:30. See Jan Lambrecht, Marcus Interpretator: Stijl en Boodschap in Mc. 3,20-4,34, (Brugge and Utrecht: Desclée de Brouwer, 1969), pp. 67-68; Egger, "Verborgenheit," p. 472; idem, Frohbotschaft, p. 97.

in redactional verses.[1] Again the content of the verse is decisive. Mark is generalizing, drawing on material he uses elsewhere. The words προσπίπτω and κράζω are drawn from the miracle stories and exorcisms,[2] and the cry of the demons echoes the voice at the baptism and the cry in 5:7. The command to secrecy in v. 12 is formulated in indirect discourse. This links this command to the other commands to secrecy in the gospel.[3] The vocabulary of the command is Markan: adverbial πολλά,[4] ἐπιτιμάω,[5] non-final ἵνα,[6] and φανερός.[7] As in 1:34 these two verses are formulated in the imperfect to emphasize the repeated outbursts of the demons and the permanency

---

[1]Compare 9:9; 11:19; 13:4, 7; 14:7. See Schenke, Studien, p. 100, n. 1. Ὅταν with the indicative is a peculiarity of Mark's style. See John C. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1909), pp. 13, 35.

[2]For προσπίπτω compare 5:33; 7:25. For κράζω compare 5:5, 7; 9:26. See Egger, "Verborgenheit," p. 472; idem, Frohbotschaft, p. 98.

[3]Compare 5:43; 7:36; 8:30; 9:9; 10:48. See Max Zerwick, Untersuchungen zum Markus-Stil: Eine Beitrag zur stilistischen Durcharbeitung des Neuen Testaments, Scripta pontificii instituti biblici (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1937), pp. 25-6.

[4]1:45; 3:12; 5:10, 23, 38, 43; 6:20; 9:26, 15:3. See Hawkins, pp. 13, 35; Zerwick, p. 123; G. D. Kilpatrick, "Some Notes on Markan Usage," The Bible Translator 7 (1956): 7-8.

[5]1:25; 3:12; 4:39; 8:30, 32, 33; 9:25; 10:13, 48. It is redactional at 3:12, 8:30, 32, 33; 10:48. On the meaning of the word see George A. Barton, "The Use of ἐπιτιμᾶν in Mark 8:30 and 3:12," JBL 41 (1922): 233-36; Kilpatrick, "Notes," p. 6; Howard Clark Kee. "The Terminology of Mark's Exorcism Stories," NTS 14 (1967-68): 232-46.

[6]C. H. Turner, "Marcan Usage: Notes, Critical and Exegetical, on the Second Gospel," JTS 29 (1927-28): 356-59.

[7]Compare redactional usage in 6:14. See Egger, "Verborgenheit," pp. 472-73; idem, Frohbotschaft, p. 98, n. 81.

of the commands to silence. These two verses form the climax of the summary. Mark is not primarily concerned to portray Jesus as the wonder-worker but rather to show who lies hidden behind this man.[1] Here the demons do not use the rare title "the Holy One of God" but the significant title "the Son of God." This is the title used by the voice from heaven in the baptism. It will be used in the Transfiguration and again in the centurion's confession at the foot of the cross. It has great significance for Mark and its presence here is an indication of how completely Mark has drawn the exorcisms and the commands to silence into his total Christological conception.[2] The demons have accurate knowledge about Jesus. They know who he is and they are forbidden to speak precisely because they know who he is. The content of the messianic secret is the identity of Jesus. Who Jesus is is what the secret is all about. The secret is a Markan Christological theme. Here, too, the command comes too late. Jesus silences the demons only after they have cried out. Of course Mark understands that those present do not hear the cries of the demons, but Mark's readers do hear. They hear the truth about Jesus, but then the truth is immediately withdrawn by the command to silence.

In the story of the Gerasene demoniac (5:1-20) the demon addresses Jesus as "Son of the most high God" (5:7). The passage continues: "For he had been saying to him, 'Unclean spirit, come out of the man!'" (5:8). This verse is redactional and it functions as a command to silence. Mark likes to use

---

[1] Reploh, pp. 39-40. [2] Horstmann, p. 120.

the third person imperfect of λέγω.[1] The sentence is an explanatory γάρ clause which Mark uses often.[2] These clauses give the impression of being tacked on as afterthoughts. They are really, though, parentheses that impart information that is essential to the narrative.[3] The wording of the command is close to the wording of 1:25, with the most notable difference being the omission of the initial "Be silent!" The reason for this omission is that the story goes on to record the dialogue about the demon's name. Mark did not want to omit this dialogue so he could not have Jesus say "Be silent!" and then have Jesus ask the demon his name. However, he does want a command after the demon calls Jesus "Son of the most high God" so he added the command in a γάρ explanatory clause. This is not the only instance of a command to silence that does not explicitly say "Be silent!" or "Say nothing to anyone!" In the cure of the blind man (8:22-26) the command to secrecy is "Do not go into the village!" (8:26). Jesus' desire for secrecy seems to be contradicted by the end of the story of

---

[1] Statistics: 10 50 23 46 11 (The numbers refer to Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts, always in this order.) See Hawkins, pp. 12, 52.

[2] 1:16, 22; 2:15; 3:10, 21; 5:8, 28, 42; 6:14, 18, 31, 52; 9:6 bis, 31; 10:22; 11:13, 18, 32; 14:2, 40; 15:10; 16:4, 8 bis. See M.-J. Lagrange, Evangile selon Saint Marc, Etudes bibliques, 5th ed. (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1929), pp. LXXXI-LXXXII; C. H. Bird, "Some γάρ Clauses in St. Mark's Gospel," JTS 4 (1953): 171-87; Thierry Snoy, "La rédaction marcienne de la marche sur les eaux (Mc. VI,45-52)," ETL 44 (1968), p. 448, n. 218.

[3] Compare 3:21; 5:28; 6:18; 14:2. These clauses are also formulated in the third person imperfect of λέγω. The narratives in which they appear cannot be understood without them. At least 14:2 is redactional. See Schenke, Studien, pp. 46-53.

the Gerasene demoniac (5:18-20). Jesus orders the man to go and tell what the Lord has done for him. The man goes and preaches what Jesus has done for him. What we have here is the beginning of the gentile mission.[1] This is a theme that is important for Mark. In the summary in 3:7-12 the people who flock to Jesus come even from outside Jewish territory. In 7:24-30 Jesus comes to the aid of a gentile woman. After the cleansing of the temple Jesus says, "Is it not written, 'My house will be called a house of prayer for all nations'?" (11:17). The gospel is to be preached to all nations (13:10) throughout the whole world (14:9). The first one to confess the crucified Christ is a gentile centurion (15:39). The closing scene of the story of the Gerasene demoniac stands in the service of this theological concern of Mark, and a command to secrecy at this point could not be united with it.[2]

In the two remaining exorcisms in Mark the demon does not speak so there is no need for a command to silence. In 7:24-30 the exorcism is performed at a distance and in 9:14-29 the demon cannot speak!

The commands to silence addressed to the demons have shown that the secrecy motif is in part a literary technique that enables Mark to impart to his readers revelation about who Jesus is. He is the Holy One of God. He is the Son of God. These revelations come from the demons. They are other-

---

[1]Rudolf Pesch, Der Besessene von Gerasa: Entstehung und Überlieferung einer Wundergeschichte, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, vol. 56 (Stuttgart: KBW, 1972), pp. 47-48.

[2]Horstmann, p. 121.

worldly and they have other-worldly insight.[1] They call Jesus by the same name the voice from heaven calls him. Yet at the same time this revelation is suppressed. No one may know that Jesus is the Holy One of God, the Son of God. A veil is drawn over the revelation. The identity of Jesus is a secret.

Commands to Silence after Miracles

The first command to silence after a miracle story occurs in the healing of the leper (1:40-45). The story has puzzled commentators because it is not clear why Jesus is angry with the leper. The language of v. 43 is strong, "And angry with him he immediately drove him away." We are not dealing with a technique of the miracle worker which is appropriate in v. 41, but impossible here.[2] The strong language is meant to reinforce the command to secrecy and to show that Jesus means seriously what he commands.[3] Pesch contends that the command not to tell anyone is traditional. The intention was to let the miracle talk. The leper was to say nothing to anyone but to show himself to the priest. The official attestation of the cure would speak for itself.[4] Bultmann's opinion,

---

[1] According to Wrede, Secret, p. 25, "Spirit comprehends spirit."

[2] Campbell Bonner, "Traces of Thaumaturgic Technique in the Miracles," HTR 20 (1927): 171-81.

[3] Erich Klostermann, Das Markusevangelium, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, vol. 3, 5th ed. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1971), p. 21.

[4] Rudolf Pesch, Jesu ureigene Taten?: Ein Beitrag zur Wunderfrage, Quaestiones disputatae, vol. 52 (Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1970), pp. 72-73.

though, that the command to silence is Markan is correct.[1] The command, "Go, show yourself to the priest and offer for your purification what Moses prescribed as a witness to them," is traditional. It contains the traditional dismissal formula and provides for the demonstration of the miracle. Mark has added the command to silence ὅρα μηδενὶ μηδὲν εἴπῃς, connecting it to the traditional command with ἀλλά. The resulting sentence contains elements of duality which are characteristic of Mark's style: double imperative, double negative, and a negative expression followed by a positive one introduced by ἀλλά.[2] The wording of the command has a close parallel in another redactional passage: οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπαν (16:8).[3] Mark also added v. 43 as a strong introduction to the command. We are not told why Jesus commands the man to keep silence, but we can infer the reason for the command from the result of the failure of the leper to obey. The leper goes out and begins to preach many things and to spread the word around with the result that Jesus can no longer go openly into the city but must stay outside in deserted places (1:45). This verse contains many Markan elements: ἐξέρχομαι,[4] the aorist of

---

[1] Bultmann, History, p. 212.

[2] Frans Neirynck, Duality in Mark: Contributions to the Study of the Markan Redaction, Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium, vol. 31 (Louvain: Leuven University, 1972), pp. 84-85, 87-88, 90-94.

[3] Ludger Schenke, Auferstehungsverkündigung und leeres Grab: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung von Mk 16,1-8, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, vol. 33 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1968), p. 47; Snoy, "Rédaction," pp. 436-38, n. 169.

[4] Redactional at 1:28, 29, 35, 38, 45; 2:13; 3:6; 5:8;

ἄρχομαι with the infinitive,[1] κηρύσσω,[2] adverbial πολλά,[3] λόγος,[4] ὥστε with the infinitive,[5] ἔρημος τόπος,[6] and πρὸς αὐτόν with reference to Jesus.[7] The convergence of these

---

6:1, 12, 34, 54; 7:31; 8:11, 27; 9:30; 11:11, 12. See Erich Grässer, "Jesus in Nazareth (Mark VI.1-6a): Notes on the Redaction and Theology of St. Mark," NTS 16 (1969-70), p. 9. n. 4.

[1]1:45; 2:23; 4:1; 5:17, 20; 6:2, 7, 34, 55; 8:11, 31, 32; 10:28, 32, 41, 47; 11:15; 12:1; 13:5; 14:19, 33, 65, 69, 71; 15:8, 18. The construction is a Markan style characteristic (Statistics: 9 26 19 1 5). It is redactional at 1:45; 4:1; 5:20; 6:2, 7, 34, 55; 8:31, 32; 10:28, 32, 41; 12:1; 13:5. See J. W. Hunkin, "'Pleonastic' ἄρχομαι in the New Testament," JTS 25 (1923-24): 390-402; Turner, "Usage," 28 (1926-27): 352-53; Lagrange, pp. LXIX, XCIII-XCIV; John Charles Doudna, The Greek of the Gospel of Mark, Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, vol. 12 (Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1961), pp. 51-53, 111-17; Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to Mark, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1966), pp. 48, 63-64; Paul J. Achtemeier, "Toward the Isolation of Pre-Markan Miracle Catenae, JBL 89 (1970), p. 267, n. 5; Schenke, Studien, p. 227; Howard Clark Kee, Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel (Philadelphia: Westminister, 1977), pp. 51, 53-54.

[2]1:4, 7, 14, 38, 39, 45; 3:14, 5:20; 6:12; 7:36; 13:10; 14:9. All are redactional except possibly 1:4, 7. See Luz, p. 15, n. 23; Eduard Schweizer, "Anmerkungen zur Theologie des Markus," Neotestamentica: German and English Essays 1951-1963 (Zürich and Stuttgart: Zwingli, 1963), pp. 93-94.

[3]See above, p. 18, n. 4.

[4]Redactional at 1:45; 2:2; 4:33; 8:32. See Kilpatrick, "Notes," pp. 2-3; Luz, p. 15, n. 24; Ingrid Maisch, Die Heilung des Gelähmten: Eine exegetisch-traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Mk 2,1-12, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, vol. 52 (Stuttgart: KBW, 1971), pp. 15-16.

[5]Redactional at 1:45; 3:10, 20; 4:1. See Luz, p. 15, n. 24.

[6]Redactional at 1:35, 45; 6:31, 32. See Snoy, "Rédaction," p. 239, n. 143.

[7]Redactional at 1:32, 45; 2:13; 3:8, 13; 4:1; 7:1; 10:1; 11:27; 12:18. See Luz, p. 15, n. 24.

elements indicates that Mark composed the entire verse.[1] By these additions Mark has bent the ending of the story in the direction of a general desire of Jesus to remain hidden. The reason for the command is that Jesus wants to remain hidden.

Double secrecy surrounds the raising of the daughter of Jairus (5:21-24, 35-43). Jesus allows only a few to witness the miracle--Peter, James, John, and the girl's parents.[2] Dibelius and Bultmann deny that this motif has anything to do with the messianic secret. Its intention is to protect the miracle from profane eyes.[3] While this may be the meaning of the traditional motif, Mark undoubtedly saw this as one more manifestation of Jesus' desire to remain hidden and to seek privacy.[4] This is shown by 9:2 and 13:3 where Mark combines the separation of three or four disciples with the phrase κατ' ἰδίαν.[5] After he has raised the girl he commands that no one know this (5:43). The command is a redactional addition of Mark. The verb διαστέλλω is a Markan word.[6]

---

[1]See further Egger, Frohbotschaft, pp. 79-84.

[2]The separation of three or four disciples is a Markan theme. On the separation of three, see 5:37; 9:2; 14:33. Compare also 3:16-19 where the three receive special names. On the separation of four, see 1:16-20, 29; 13:3. See Lambrecht, Redaktion, pp. 82-85; Schenke, Studien, pp. 480-85.

[3]Dibelius, Tradition, pp. 93-94; Bultmann, History, p. 224.

[4]Sjöberg, Der verborgene Menschensohn, pp. 111-12, 154-55.

[5]Horstmann, pp. 83-85.

[6]5:43; 7:36 bis; 8:15; 9:9. Statistics: 0 5 0 0 1. All five occurrences are redactional. See Johannes M. Nützel,

Adverbial πολλά and non-final ἵνα are also Markan.[1] No reason for the command is given. We can presume, though, by comparison with the command to the leper that Mark's Jesus wished to avoid the notoriety that would result from the knowledge of such an extraordinary wonder. Although we are not told that the command was disobeyed, the miracle would inevitably become known.

The cure of the deaf-mute (7:31-37) is also a private cure. Jesus takes the man away from the crowd. The two phrases κατ' ἰδίαν and ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου (7:33) are both redactional.[2] Mark is again expressing Jesus' desire for secrecy. After the cure Jesus again imposes silence (7:36). This command is also redactional. The general formulation does not fit the context of a cure; it is a sign of Markan redaction.[3] The verbs διαστέλλω and κηρύσσω,[4] non-final ἵνα, ὅσος,[5] περισσότερος[6]

Die Verklärungserzählung im Markusevangelium: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung, Forschung zur Bibel, vol. 6 (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1973), p. 155.

[1]See above, p. 18, nn. 4, 6.

[2]Mark uses κατ' ἰδίαν seven times (4:34; 6:31, 32; 7:33; 9:2, 28; 13:3) and ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου twice (7:17, 33). All occurrences of both terms are redactional. See Schweizer, "Anmerkungen," p. 99; Lambrecht, Redaktion, pp. 83-84; Minette de Tillesse, pp. 174-75, 237-42; Pesch, Naherwartungen, pp. 97-98.

[3]Sjöberg, Der verborgene Menschensohn, pp. 156-57.

[4]See above, p. 24, n. 2; p. 25, n. 6.

[5]Redactional at 3:8, 10, 28; 5:19, 20; 6:30, 56, 7:36; 9:13. See Luz, p. 16, n. 31.

[6]Compare redactional ἐκ περισσοῦ in 6:51, redactional ὑπερπερισσῶς in 7:37, and redactional ἐκπερισσῶς in 14:31. The last two words are found only in Mark in all Greek litera-

are all Markan. There are also elements of duality: the repetition of the verb and the pattern of command and non-fulfilment.[1] There is a particularly close parallel in 10:48 which also has μᾶλλον in the second clause to contrast the non-fulfilment with the command. We are not told why Jesus orders silence, but again we can infer the reason from the crowd's failure to obey. The people say, "He has done all things well; he has made the deaf hear and the dumb speak (7:37). This Chorschluss follows immediately on the command. Its purpose is to draw attention to the miracle and the miracle worker. It is this according to Mark that Jesus is negating. Jesus does not want to attract attention to himself. The general comment, "The more he commanded them, the more rather they announced it" (7:36b), formulated in the imperfect, shows that the commands to silence are meant to be understood with all the miracles whether they are explicitly mentioned or not.

After the cure of the blind man Jesus sends him away to his house saying, "Do not go into the village" (8:26).[2]

---

ture. See Snoy, "Rédaction," pp. 440-42; Schenke, Studien, pp. 418-19.

[1]Neirynck, pp. 77-81, 120-21.

[2]The text is uncertain. The textus receptus is a conflated text: μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς μηδὲ εἴπῃς τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ. Behind this text are two earlier readings:
(1) μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς (ℵ^{c} B L f^{1} syr^{s} cop^{sa}, bo,fay)
(2) μηδενὶ εἴπῃς ἐν τῇ κώμῃ (it^{k}).
Reading (1) is probably the original reading. It is strongly attested, and reading (2) is probably an attempt to clarify the meaning of reading (1). See Bruce M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (London and New York: United Bible Societies, 1971), pp. 98-99. Turner, "Usage,"

The command is a redactional addition of Mark. In v. 23 Jesus took the blind man outside the village. Mark develops his secrecy theme by forbidding the man to reenter the village. There is no direct command to keep silent, but the contrast between the private domain "house" and the public domain "village" shows that we have an indirect command to secrecy.[1] The blind man is not to publicize the miracle.

Not all of the miracle stories end with a command to silence. The commands that we have seen are attached to miracles that already contain a secrecy motif. Only the three disciples and the girl's parents witness the raising of the girl. The deaf-mute is drawn away from the crowd, and the blind man is led outside the village. Although it is not stated explicitly, the leper apparently comes to Jesus alone, apart from the crowd. In the traditional story this may have reflected Jewish law concerning the leper.[2] The purpose of the traditional motif of secret healing was to protect the working of God's power from the eyes of the profane.[3] It is to miracle stories that contain this motif that Mark has added his commands to silence. A command to silence would not be appropriate after the cure of the paralytic (2:1-12) or the cure of the man with the withered hand (3:1-6) which

---

26 (1924-25): 18, tries to get behind the two readings to an original μηδε(νὶ) εἰς τὴν κώμην εἴπῃς. He is followed by Taylor, pp. 372-73, and Burkill, Revelation, p. 81.

[1]Horstmann, p. 120, n. 82. [2]Lev 13:45-46.

[3]See above, p. 25.

are embedded in controversy stories. The miracle in both cases is hurled at Jesus' opponents. Nor would a command be possible after the two feeding miracles with the multitude of witnesses present in both. The same can be said of the story of the hemorrhaging woman (5:25-34). Although the miracle occurred with no one noticing it (vv. 27-29), Mark is concerned in the entire section of Jairus' daughter and the hemorrhaging woman (5:21-43) with the theme of faith and salvation.[1] Jesus has the woman confess the whole truth (v. 33) so that he can comment on her faith and clearly formulate the theme (v. 34). A command to secrecy would then be impossible. In the two sea miracles (4:35-41; 6:45-52) Mark is more concerned to point out the unbelief of the disciples and their lack of understanding. Both narratives end on this note and a command to secrecy would be awkward. The cure of Simon's mother-in-law is portrayed as a private healing.[2] Jesus is accompanied by only four disciples; and the healing takes place in a house, a private place, in contrast to the synagogue where Jesus has just expelled the unclean spirit. Although other private healings have a command to secrecy, Mark dispenses with it here, probably because of the extreme brevity of the account. No reaction whatever of the witnesses is recorded. Mark's general intent, though, is that the

---

[1] 5:23, 28, 34, 36.

[2] Rudolf Pesch, "Die Heilung der Schwiegermutter des Simon-Petrus: Ein Beispiel heutiger Synoptikerexegese," Neuere Exegese--Verlust oder Gewinn? (Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1968), p. 161; idem, "Tag," p. 185.

commands to silence are an ordinary part of Jesus' healings. The general formulation of the command in 7:36 with the recurring imperfects in v. 36b shows that Mark intends the commands to secrecy to be understood as following the miracles generally.[1]

Luz maintains that the injunctions to silence after the miracles are different from those addressed to the demons and the disciples (8:30 and 9:9). He distinguishes between a miracle secret and the messianic secret. After the miracles the injunction to silence simply reinforces the impossibility of the miracles' being kept secret. By their very nature they force themselves into the public realm. The messianic secret on the other hand is meant to prevent the disclosure of Jesus' messiahship before the crucifixion when it can be understood.[2] Wrede, however, insisted that there be a unified explanation of all the data that he isolated as part of the messianic secret.[3]

An examination of three passages that are important for Mark's understanding of the miracles shows that Luz's distinction is not valid. At the conclusion of the stilling of the storm Jesus reproaches the disciples, "Why are you cowardly? Do you not yet have faith?" (4:40). The disciples say to one another, "Who can he be, for even the wind and the sea obey him?" (4:41). The miracles raise the question of faith; they raise the question of who Jesus is. The

---

[1] See further Horstmann, pp. 123-25; Luz, pp. 11-12.

[2] Luz, pp. 17, 26, 28. [3] Wrede, Secret, pp. 37-39.

revelation of who Jesus is is precisely what is suppressed in the commands to the demons and to the disciples. In the pericope of the rejection of Jesus in his native land (6:1-6a), his countrymen are amazed at his wisdom and the wonders that are done through his hands (6:2). Again the question of who he is arises, but only to be answered in terms of his human origin (6:3). Jesus is not able to work many miracles because of their unbelief (6:5-6). The story centers on faith.[1] Mark's main interpretation of the miracles is to link them to faith, to make them dependent on faith.[2] In the introduction to the account of the death of John the Baptist (6:14-16), Mark lists the opinions of people about the identity of Jesus. This account had nothing to do with Herod originally. This is shown by the word ἔλεγον[3] in v. 14 and by v. 16 which gives the impression that it is tacked on.[4] Mark composed vv. 14a and 16 to connect the opinions about Jesus with Herod and thus to introduce the story of the death of John. In v. 14a Jesus' name has become known, and this is brought into relationship with his miracles in v. 14b. The miracles raise

---

[1]Grässer, p. 22.

[2]Glasswell, pp. 154-62; Kertelge, Wunder, pp. 197-99; Vernon K. Robbins, "Dynameis and Semeia in Mark," Biblical Research 18 (1973): 18-19.

[3]The plural ἔλεγον (B W it$^{a,b,d,ff^2}$) is to be preferred to the singular ἔλεγεν (ℵ A C K L Δ Θ Π f^{1} f^{13} al) which is a scribal assimilation to the singular ἤκουσεν. See Taylor, p. 308; Metzger, p. 89.

[4]Joachim Gnilka, "Das Martyrium Johannes' des Täufers (Mk 6,17-29)," Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker, ed. Paul Hoffmann with Norbert Brox and Wilhelm Pesch (Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1973), p. 81, n. 7.

the question of who Jesus is. It is for this reason that they are suppressed by the commands to silence. The commands to the demons and to the disciples are also intended to suppress the knowledge and revelation of who Jesus is.

Some terminological considerations also show that Luz's distinction between a miracle secret and the messianic secret is not valid. There is an interesting link between the command in 3:12 and the passage we have just considered, 6:14. In 3:12 the demons are commanded not to make Jesus known (...ἵνα μὴ αὐτὸν φανερὸν ποιήσωσιν). In 6:14 it is stated that his name has become known (φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ); and this is linked with his miracles (v. 14b). The aim of the commands after the miracles is the same as that of the commands to the demons and the disciples. The commands are also formulated similarly. Compare, for example, 5:43 and 7:36, both of which Luz attributes to the miracle secret, with 9:9, which for him is part of the messianic secret. Mark intends a connection, not a distinction, between the commands.[1]

According to Mark Jesus did not want to attract attention by his miracles. The miracles raise the question of who Jesus is. It is for this reason that they are suppressed just as the commands to the demons suppress the revelation of who Jesus is contained in the demons' cries.

The commands to secrecy after the miracles are part of

---

[1]For further discussion of Luz's thesis, see Horstmann, pp. 125-26; Schenke, Studien, p. 432, n. 1.

a general portrayal of the spread of Jesus' fame and his efforts to remain hidden. Jesus' fame mounts and there is an oppressive flow of the crowds to him.[1] At the same time there is the opposite movement of Jesus to remain hidden, to withdraw from the crowds.[2] The boat that Jesus has to resort to is a symbol of this pressure on him. There is a tension between Jesus' desire to remain hidden and the steadily increasing attention that is given to his person. This is the tension of the secret. It is also evident in the disobedience of those whom Jesus commands. The leper publishes his cure. The girl's parents could scarcely hide her return to life. After the cure of the deaf man, the more Jesus commanded the people to be silent, the more they spread the word. Despite Jesus' efforts to remain hidden he cannot.[3]

Mark's Parable Theory

The parable discourse (4:1-34) is the first long speech of Jesus in Mark. It consists of an introduction (vv. 1-2), the parable of the sower (vv. 3-8) and its explanation (vv. 14-20) separated by a saying on the purpose of teaching in parables (vv. 10-13), the parables of the lamp (vv. 21-22) and the measure (vv. 24b-25),[4] the parable of the seed growing

---

[1] 1:28, 33, 37, 45; 2:2; 3:7-10, 20; 4:1; 5:21, 24, 31; 6:14, 31-34, 54-56; 8:1.

[2] 1:35, 38; 2:1; 3:7, 9; 4:1, 36; 5:37, 40; 6:31-32, 45-46; 7:24, 33.

[3] See especially 7:24.

[4] These are commonly classified as sayings, but Mark probably considered them parables. See Lambrecht, Marcus

of itself (vv. 26-29), the parable of the mustard seed (vv. 30-32), and a conclusion (vv. 33-34). Within the discourse there are also several commands to listen (vv. 3, 9, 23-24a).[1] According to Mark there is a sharp division between those who are given the mystery of the kingdom of God and those who are outside. The parables are unintelligible riddles. They are explained to the disciples; but the outsiders are taught only in parables so that they might look and not see, listen and not understand lest they turn and be forgiven. This is Mark's parable theory. He expresses it by interpolating a saying based in part on Isa 6:9-10 between the parable of the sower and its interpretation. The saying is introduced by v. 10: "And when he was alone, those about him with the twelve asked him about the parables." The clause καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο κατὰ μόνας is redactional. The phrase κατὰ μόνας is not found elsewhere in Mark. However, it is Mark who is concerned to show separation. He does this with a variety of terms, κατ' ἰδίαν, ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου, and here κατὰ μόνας.[2] A particularly close parallel is the redactional κατ' ἰδίαν μόνους in 9:2.[3] Mark uses ἐρωτάω rarely, preferring instead

---

Interpretator, pp. 106-111.

[1]On the structure of the parable discourse, see Lambrecht, Marcus Interpretator, pp. 121-24; idem, "Redaction and Theology in Mk., IV," L'évangile selon Marc: Tradition et rédaction, Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium, vol. 34, ed. M. Sabbe (Louvain: Leuven University, 1974), pp. 303-304.

[2]See above, p. 26, n. 2.

[3]Horstmann, p. 85.

ἐπερωτάω.[1] The verb ἤρώτων is thus probably part of the traditional transition from the parable to its explanation. Jesus is asked about the parables by "those about him with the twelve." This phrase is redactional. Mark uses "the twelve" without any further determination frequently.[2] The other part of the double expression, "those about him," need not be traditional. In double expressions like this one both parts may be redactional.[3] A good parallel is 8:34 where the double expression καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ is completely redactional.[4] In the preceding pericope Mark has described the crowd as sitting around Jesus (περὶ αὐτόν, 3:32, 34) and contrasted them sharply with his relatives who are standing outside (ἔξω, 3:31-32). He reuses the same pair of terms to sharply contrast two groups here, even though the groups are different.[5] The source Mark is using must have had a connecting sentence between the parable and its explanation. The listeners would have asked (ἐρωτάω) about the parable (singular). Mark added the motif

---

[1]Statistics: ἐρωτάω 4 3 15 27 7; ἐπερωτάω 8 25 17 2 2.

[2]3:14, 16; 4:10; 6:7; 9:35; 10:32; 11:11; 14:10, 17, 20, 43. See Joachim Gnilka, Die Verstockung Israels: Isaias 6,9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker, Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, vol. 3 (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1961), p. 59.

[3]Neirynck, pp. 49-50.

[4]Rudolf Schnackenburg, "'Das Evangelium' im Verständnis des ältesten Evangelisten," Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker, ed. Paul Hoffmann with Norbert Brox and Wilhelm Pesch (Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1973), pp. 317-18.

[5]Lambrecht, "Mk., IV," pp. 279-80.

of separation and private questioning and changed the singular to the plural to prepare for the general formulation of vv. 11-12.[1] The second framing verse, v. 13, is completely redactional. The historical present,[2] πῶς,[3] and the double question[4] point to Mark. The verse is closely paralleled by 7:18. In both verses there is a double question. One of the questions is specific, referring to the immediate context (4:13: οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην;[5] 7:18: οὐ νοεῖτε ὅτι...;). The other question is broader, reproaching the disciples for a general lack of understanding (4:13: καὶ πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνώσεσθε; 7:18: οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀσύνετοί ἐστε;). The same pattern of reproach is found after the stilling of the storm where the disciples are reproached specifically for their cowardice (v. 40a) and generally for their lack of faith (v. 40b).[6] The content of v. 13 also points to Markan redaction; Mark is developing here his theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples.[7]

The verses that are interpolated between the parable and its explanation are considered to be traditional by

---

[1]Ibid., p. 279. [2]Zerwick, p. 64; Hawkins, pp. 143-49.

[3]Statistics: 14 15 16 20 9. It is used redactionally at 4:13; 9:12; 14:1, 11. See Schenke, Studien, p. 42; Lambrecht, "Mk., IV," pp. 280, 294.

[4]Neirynck, pp. 125-31.

[5]The Markan parallels show that this is a question. See Neirynck, p. 57.

[6]Compare the series of reproachful questions in 8:17-21. See Snoy, "Rédaction," pp. 466-67.

[7]Compare 6:52; 7:18; 8:14-21.

Jeremias.[1] There are many signs, though, of Markan redactional activity. The introductory phrase καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς is a Markan link-phrase.[2] We have seen that Mark has introduced his typical separation in v. 10. Therefore the contrast between "to you" and "to those outsiders" in v. 11 is probably from his hand.[3] The word "mystery" appears only here in Mark. However, the word has a rich background in contemporary Judaism and Christianity and came to Mark from this background.[4] The kingdom of God was a theme already present to Mark in the parables.[5] The phrase ἐν παραβολαῖς occurs redactionally in 3:23; 4:2; and 12:1.[6] There is thus evidence of considerable Markan redaction in v. 11.[7] Verse 12 is a quotation from Isa 6:9-10. The quotation follows the Targum. Mark and the Targum have the verbs in the first half of the quotation in the third person in contrast to the Masoretic

---

[1]Joachim Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, trans. S. H. Hooke, rev. ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), pp. 13-18.

[2]2:27; 4:2, 11, 21, 24; 6:4, 10; 7:9; 8:21; 9:1, 31; 11:17. See Jeremias, Parables, p. 14; Achtemeier, p. 267, n. 6; Kee, Community, pp. 51-52.

[3]Lambrecht, "Mk., IV," p. 283.

[4]1 Enoch 103:2; 106:19; 1QS 11:3-8; 1QH 7:26-32; 13:13-14; 1QpHab 7:1-8; 1 Cor 2:6-16.

[5]Lambrecht, "Mk., IV," p. 283.

[6]Παραβολή is a Markan word: 3:23; 4:2, 10, 11, 13 bis, 30, 33, 34; 7:17; 12:1, 12; 13:28. All uses are redactional except 4:10 (Mark's source had the singular) and possibly 4:30. See Schweizer, "Anmerkungen," pp. 97-99; Lambrecht, Marcus Interpretator, pp. 55-56, 106-108, 111, 127; Snoy, "Rédaction," p. 459, n. 266.

[7]See further Lambrecht, "Mk., IV," pp. 282-84.

Text and the Septuagint which both have the verbs in the second person. Mark also agrees with the Targum in the use of the verb "to forgive" in the second half of the quotation instead of the verb "to heal" which is found in the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint.[1] Mark has shortened the quotation and changed the order of the participles.[2]

Mark returns to the parable theory in the concluding verses of the parable chapter (vv. 33-34). Verse 34 is redactional. It does contain three hapax legomena (χωρίς, ἴδιοι μαθηταί, and ἐπιλύω). However, their presence does not necessarily mean that the verse is traditional. The preposition χωρίς is relatively rare. Mark does know χωρέω (2:2) and χωρίζω (10:9).[3] The adjective ἴδιοι was suggested to Mark by the expression κατ' ἰδίαν.[4] It is used to highlight the strong contrast in the chapter between the disciples and those outside: Jesus explains everything privately to his own disciples. The verb ἐπιλύω is a technical word for the explana-

---

[1]Gnilka, Verstockung, pp. 16, 24-28; Aloysius M. Ambrozic, The Hidden Kingdom: A Redaction-critical Study of the References to the Kingdom of God in Mark's Gospel, Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, vol. 2 (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1972), pp. 47-48.

[2]Kelber maintains that Mark has changed the order of the participles to emphasize "seeing." See Werner H. Kelber, The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), p. 35. The change is rather intended to emphasize "hearing." The verb ἀκούω occurs in vv. 3, 9 bis, 12 bis, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23 bis, 24, 33. On the hearing theme see Lambrecht, Marcus Interpretator, pp. 124-27.

[3]Minette de Tillesse, p. 183.

[4]Kelber, p. 34.

tion of dreams and secrets and is appropriate here.[1] There are positive indications of Markan redaction in the verse. The expression κατ' ἰδίαν is Markan.[2] The verse would not be a suitable conclusion to a collection of parables but makes sense as a reiteration of Mark's parable theory.[3] Verse 33 is also redactional. The vocabulary indicates this: τοιοῦτος,[4] λαλέω τὸν λόγον,[5] καθώς,[6] δύναμαι,[7] ἀκούω.[8] The problem of the two verses is their relationship to each other. Verse 34 is a correction of v. 33.[9] In v. 33 Mark expresses a spontaneous opinion about the purpose of parables. They are fitted to the ability of the listeners to hear them. Then in v. 34 he immediately corrects himself by reaffirming the parable theory that he has presented in vv. 11-12.[10] The fact that both

---

[1]Minette de Tillesse, p. 184.

[2]See above, p. 26, n. 2.

[3]Lambrecht, "Mk., IV," p. 274.

[4]Statistics: 3 6 2 2 4.

[5]Redactional at 2:2 and 8:32. On λαλέω and λόγος see above, p. 14, n. 3, and p. 24, n. 4.

[6]Statistics: 3 8 17 31 11. It is redactional at least at 4:33; 9:13; 14:21; 16:7.

[7]Statistics: 27 33 26 36 21. See Turner, "Usage," 28 (1926-27): 354-55.

[8]It is used here because of the hearing theme; see above, p. 38, n. 2.

[9]The tension between the two verses was felt by Matthew and Luke. Matthew dropped the disturbing phrase καθὼς ἠδύναντο ἀκούειν (Matt 13:34-35), and Luke omitted the verses.

[10]Lambrecht, "Mk., IV," pp. 275-77.

views are held together in these two verses from Mark's hand must be taken into account in any explanation of Mark's parable theory. The parable theory cannot be absolutized. From vv. 21-25 it is clear that full revelation will come ultimately. In v. 33 Mark spontaneously voices his opinion that Jesus spoke to be understood. The division and hardening expressed in vv. 11-12 and v. 34 is intended to dramatize the importance of discipleship. It is to the disciples that special explanation is given. Yet even this is not the whole story. In v. 13 Mark is careful to point out that the disciples also do not understand. The privilege that is theirs seems to be wasted on them. Mark will return to the theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples throughout the gospel.[1] It evidently was much more important to him than the narrow theory of hardening and privilege.[2]

Finally, what does Mark mean by "the mystery of the kingdom of God"? The singular with the article shows that a definite content is intended.[3] There are several pointers to what this content is. This is only the second mention of the kingdom of God in Mark. In the programmatic summary 1:14-15 Jesus comes announcing that the kingdom of God has drawn near. Between that summary and the present text lies Jesus' initial ministry of healing, teaching, and confrontation. The content

---

[1] 4:40; 6:52; 7:18; 8:14-21; 8:32-33; 9:32; 10:32.

[2] On the interpretation of Mark's parable theory, see further Lambrecht, "Mk., IV," p. 305.

[3] Gnilka, Verstockung, p. 44.

of the mystery is that the kingdom is breaking in in the ministry of Jesus. This is confirmed by the motif of the lack of understanding of the disciples which is expressed in v. 13. Jesus reproaches the disciples for not understanding even though he has just stated that the mystery of the kingdom of God has been given to them. In 4:40 the disciples are reproached for their lack of faith. They should have realized who was with them. If they had realized who Jesus is there would have been no reason to fear. Again in 6:52 the disciples are reproached for not understanding about the loaves of bread.[1] Here, too, they should have realized who Jesus is. The miracle of the loaves should have enlightened them and they should not have been astonished by Jesus' coming to them on the water. The reproach is repeated in great detail in 8:14-21. The miracles of the loaves should have revealed to the disciples who was with them. The mystery is the person of Jesus.[2] Finally, there is a hint in the Caesarea Philippi pericope. The comment in 8:32a, καὶ παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει, corresponds to 4:33a, καὶ τοιαύταις παραβολαῖς πολλαῖς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον. In 4:33a Mark has replaced μυστήριον with λόγος, and in 8:32a he has interpreted λόγος by the Son of Man saying in 8:31. The content of the word is the suffering, death, and resurrection of the Son of Man. This revelation is what is given to the disciples. The parable theory thus fits into the general

---

[1]This time they are reproached by Mark, not Jesus.

[2]Gnilka, Verstockung, pp. 34-44; Ambrozic, pp. 92-94.

Christological frame of the messianic secret.[1] In the commands to the demons and the commands after the miracles, Jesus has suppressed the revelation of who he is. So, too, here he suppresses the mystery of the kingdom of God, which is the mystery of his person, by teaching in parables. The meaning of his teaching is hidden from the outsiders. To be given the mystery it is necessary to be within the group of disciples. This requires conversion, and the parable theory is not so much a counsel to despair as a powerful summons to repentance.[2] But even the disciples who are given the mystery of the kingdom of God cannot grasp it. They remain uncomprehending.

Lack of Understanding of the Disciples

We have seen that the first place the motif of the lack of understanding of the disciples surfaces is in 4:13. The disciples are reproached for not understanding the parable of the sower in particular and Jesus' parabolic teaching in general. The parable of the sower and its interpretation is likewise the first example of public teaching and private explanation in the gospel.

The same pattern occurs in 7:14-23. The introductory verse, v. 14, is redactional. The aorist participle προσ-

---

[1]Eduard Schweizer, "Zur Frage des Messiasgeheimnis bei Markus," ZNW 56 (1965): 6; Horstmann, p. 118.

[2]The original text that Mark is quoting, Isa 6:9-10, is also an appeal to conversion. The bitter, sarcastic words are intended as a prod to provoke the people and stir them to repentance. They were included in the collection of Isaiah's oracles to call succeeding generations to return to God.

καλεσάμενος,[1] πάλιν,[2] and the imperfect of λέγω[3] are Markan. The participle προσκαλεσάμενος marks a new beginning in the story.[4] To the imperative of ἀκούω Mark adds σύνετε. This word is found five times in Mark, always in the context of the theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples.[5] The command to understand is addressed to the crowd, and a short instruction is then given to the crowd in v. 15. The crowd, though, is introduced just as a foil to the disciples.[6] The crowd is introduced just to prepare for the private questioning of the disciples and the theme of their lack of understanding. Verses 17-18 are also redactional. The house as a place of private instruction is a Markan motif.[7] The phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου further emphasizes the private instruc-

---

[1]Statistics: 6 9 4 0 9. Mark uses the aorist participle (3:23; 7:14; 8:1, 34; 10:42; 12:43; 15:44) and twice the present (3:13; 6:7). All are redactional except possibly 15:44. See Kee, Community, pp. 52-53.

[2]Statistics: 17 28 3 43 5. Redactional at 2:1, 13; 3:1, 20; 4:1; 5:21; 7:14, 31; 8:1, 13; 10:1, 10, 32; 11:27. See Turner, "Usage," 29 (1927-28): 283-87; Kilpatrick, "Notes," pp. 4-5; Snoy, "Rédaction," p. 446, n. 213.

[3]See above, p. 20, n. 1.

[4]Snoy, "Rédaction," p. 457.

[5]4:12; 6:52; 7:14; 8:17, 21.

[6]Snoy, "Rédaction," p. 458.

[7]Mark seven times refers to Jesus' being in a house with no further determination of whose house it is (οἶκος: 2:1; 3:20; 7:17; 9:28, οἰκία: 7:24; 9:33; 10:10). The house is a secret place. This is shown by the use of ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου in 7:17, κατ' ἰδίαν in 9:28, and οὐδένα ἤθελεν γνῶναι in 7:24. All of these passages are redactional. Compare also 1:29 and 8:26 in both of which the house is a private domain. See Hawkins, pp. 13, 35; Kilpatrick, "Notes," pp. 5-6; Minette de Tillesse, pp. 242-48; Snoy, "Rédaction," p. 458, n. 260.

tion.[1] The imperfect of ἐπερωτάω[2] and the word παραβολή[3] are redactional. Verse 18 contains a double question one of which is specific, referring to the immediate context, and one general, reproaching the disciples for their total lack of understanding.[4] The disciples are not better than the crowd. They also (καὶ ὑμεῖς) are without understanding. The entire frame, vv. 14, 17-18, has been constructed by Mark to bring out the theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples.

In two passages (6:51b-52 and 8:14-21) the disciples are reproached for not understanding the miracles of the loaves. The first passage comes at the end of the account of Jesus' walking on the water. Verses 51b-52 are the redactional conclusion of the pericope. The words καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος in v. 51 are lifted without any change from 4:39. Because they are a literal repetition from the account of the stilling of the storm, they are probably added here by Mark.[5] The double adverbial expression λίαν ἐκ περισσοῦ[6] is a typical example of the synonymous expressions that are common in Mark.[7] Both expressions are strong and the combination of the two

---

[1]See above, p. 26, n. 2. [2]Snoy, "Rédaction," p. 458.

[3]See above, p. 37, n. 6. [4]See above, p. 36.

[5]Snoy, "Rédaction," pp. 439-40.

[6]The expression ἐκ περισσοῦ is omitted by the Alexandrian witnesses; however, it is typical of Mark's style and should be read. See Klostermann, p. 66; Snoy, "Rédaction," p. 440, n. 185.

[7]Neirynck, pp. 101-106.

makes a deep impression. Since the phrase is steering toward v. 52 which gives the reason for the astonishment, it has a negative connotation.[1] Ἐν ἑαυτοῖς is not a common expression in Mark. However, it reflects the expression ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία πεπωρωμένη in v. 52 in a way similar to the parallelism between ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν and ἐν ἑαυτοῖς in 2:6, 8.[2] The verb ἐξίστημι occurs four times in Mark. The verb is used twice in accounts of the reactions of the witnesses of two miracles (2:12 and 5:42). There the word expresses the astonishment that the miracles cause, and it is positive. Here the astonishment of the disciples is part of their incomprehension and stems from the redactor.[3] Like the double adverbial phrase it is steering toward v. 52 where Mark attributes the lack of understanding of the disciples to the blindness of their hearts. The closest parallel to the entire clause is 10:26: οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς...[4] The construction of v. 52 is Markan. It is a γάρ explanatory clause.[5] It is formulated in two parts which are introduced by οὐκ...ἀλλά.[6] The second part is a periphrastic imperfect which is common in Mark.[7] The vocabulary overlaps the vocabulary of the other passages that treat the

---

[1]Snoy, "Rédaction," p. 441. [2]Ibid., p. 442.

[3]The fourth usage (3:21) is also negative.

[4]Snoy, "Rédaction," pp. 442-47.

[5]See above, p. 20, n. 2. [6]Neirynck, pp. 90-94.

[7]Turner, "Usage," 28 (1926-27): 349-51; Kilpatrick, "Notes," pp. 8-9; Taylor, pp. 45, 62-63.

theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples.[1] The words συνίημι, πωρόω, and καρδία all recur in 8:17.[2] Επι here has the sense "about." Καρδία is best translated "spirit." This is demanded by the connection with understanding. What Mark is talking about is the seat of understanding or insight. What is being described is an inability to understand, a spiritual blindness. The disciples react to Jesus with astonishment because they had not understood about the loaves of bread, they had not understood the miracle of the loaves. The reference is cryptic. We can search the miracle of the loaves and the account of the walking on the water in vain for an indication of what the disciples should have understood. Mark is here presenting his theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples without fully explaining it. The fuller explanation comes in 8:14-21.[3]

Mark's fullest treatment of the theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples (8:14-21) is unusually long for a dramatic speech in the gospel.[4] Except for the logion in v. 15, it is entirely redactional. The leaven saying was introduced by Mark to link the lack of understanding of the disciples with the radical unbelief of the Pharisees who in

---

[1]Quentin Quesnell, The Mind of Mark: Interpretation and Method through the Exegesis of Mark 6,52, Analecta biblica, vol. 38 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), pp. 70-71.

[2]On συνίημι see above, p. 43. Πωρόω is Markan. Statistics: 0 2 0 1 0. Compare πώρωσις: 0 1 0 0 0.

[3]Snoy, "Rédaction," pp. 449-56.

[4]Quesnell, pp. 108-110.

the preceding pericope demanded a sign from heaven (8:11-13). The introductory verse contains, besides ἄρτος, two verbs, λαμβάνω and ἔχω, that were used in the accounts of the two miracles of the loaves.[1] The use of εἰ μή is typical of Mark.[2] Verses 16-17a contain another Markan stylistic feature. A question is posed or a situation described. There is a reaction to the situation or question and a repetition in the same words of the original question or description. The clearest parallel is 2:6, 8:

> ἦσαν δέ τινες ... διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν καὶ εὐθὺς ἐπιγνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ... ὅτι οὕτως διαλογίζονται ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, λέγει αὐτοῖς· τί ταῦτα διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν; (2:6, 8)
>
> καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχουσιν. καὶ γνοὺς λέγει αὐτοῖς· τί διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε; (8:16-17)[3]

In the questions that follow we have the vocabulary of the theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples: συνίημι (compare 6:52; 7:14); νοέω (compare 7:18); πεπωρωμένη καρδία (compare 6:52). Then in v. 18 Mark identifies the disciples with the outsiders in 4:11-12; they have eyes and do not see, they have ears and do not hear. Verses 19-20 recall in question and answer form the two miracles of the loaves in precise terms. The disciples have not understood the miracles just as those outside are blinded by the parables. The disciples can recall exactly the material facts of the two miracles, but they miss the deeper significance. The one who fed the five thousand

---

[1] Snoy, "Rédaction," p. 470. [2] Neirynck, p. 89.

[3] Compare 2:15-16; 6:48-49. See Snoy, "Rédaction," pp. 472-73.

with five loaves and the four thousand with seven loaves is more than able to feed them with the one loaf they have. What the disciples have missed is the person of Jesus. He is hidden behind the miracles which are parables in action. The final question (οὔπω συνίετε;) to which the disciples do not respond indicates that even the detailed recalling of the miracles of the loaves is not sufficient to break through their blindness. It is now possible to understand better the lack of comprehension of the disciples after the walking on the water. The mystery of Jesus remains closed to them even when it is so clearly revealed as in the miracle of the walking on the water. Because of their blindness the miracle is an enigma to them.[1]

The parable theory and the theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples show us the ecclesiological aspect of the messianic secret. The revelation of who Jesus is takes place in the community: "to you the mystery of the kingdom of God is given" (4:11). The disciples, though, do not understand. The revelation is not grasped, and who Jesus is remains a secret.

The question of Jesus' identity, though, keeps surfacing. After the exorcism in Capernaum all are astounded: "What is this? A new teaching with authority! He commands even the unclean spirits and they obey him!" (1:27). When Jesus forgives the paralytic's sins the scribes say, "Who can forgive sins but God alone?" (2:7). The people in Jesus' home town (6:2-3) and Herod and the general population (6:14-16) wonder about

---

[1]Snoy, "Rédaction," pp. 473-81.

who he is. But the question especially concerns the disciples. Their lack of understanding is a failure to understand who Jesus is. But although they do not understand, the question is there nonetheless. In a passage that also expresses the lack of understanding theme, the conclusion of the pericope of the stilling of the storm (4:40-41), Jesus reproaches the disciples for their cowardice and their lack of faith. They react with the question: "Who then is this, for even the wind and the sea obey him?" (4:41).[1] The question cannot not be asked.

The Discipleship Section

A shift in the development of the messianic secret occurs at the beginning of the discipleship section (8:27-10:52). The question that Jesus has up to this point suppressed he now places squarely on the agenda. He asks the disciples, "Who do men say I am?" (8:27). They answer with the opinions that were first expressed in 6:14-16, John the Baptist, Elijah, one of the prophets (8:28). Jesus then shifts the question to squarely address the disciples: ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; (8:29). The initial ὑμεῖς is strongly emphasized by its position before the interrogative pronoun.[2] Peter answers for the group: σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός (8:29). The question that was suppressed in the first half of the gospel has been posed and

---

[1] See further Quesnell, pp. 157-61, 170-71; David J. Hawkin, "The Incomprehension of the Disciples in the Marcan Redaction," JBL 91 (1972): 296.

[2] Zerwick, p. 130.

answered. The movement of the first half of the gospel seems to come to rest; the messianic secret seems to be revealed. The disciples now know who Jesus is just as the demons do. But instead of the secret being resolved, we are plunged back into the secret. Jesus imposes silence on the disciples: καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ (8:30). The verb ἐπιτιμάω occurs in the commands to silence in 1:25 and 3:12 (with ἵνα). The phrase μηδενὶ λέγωσιν occurs in the command in 7:36. The vocabulary of this command, then, is the vocabulary of the commands we have seen. The verse is a Markan redactional comment on Peter's confession. The phrase περὶ αὐτοῦ is demanded by the context and is not unusual for Mark.[1] Furthermore, the αὐτοῖς points to Mark. Mark has emphasized the disciples in v. 27 by mentioning them twice, and he here includes them in Jesus' reaction to Peter's confession.[2] The disciples are silenced just as the demons were silenced. Who Jesus is cannot be revealed.

Jesus then begins to teach the disciples that the Son of Man must suffer, be rejected, be killed, and rise after three days. This first passion prediction is introduced by the redactional phrase καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτούς (8:31a). The aorist of ἄρχομαι with the infinitive[3] and the verb διδάσκω with Jesus as the subject[4] are Markan. The two are also

---

[1]Compare 1:30; 5:16, 27; 7:6, 25. See Horstmann, pp. 10-11.

[2]Horstmann, p. 11. [3]See above, p. 24, n. 1.

[4]Mark uses διδάσκω of Jesus fifteen times: 1:21, 22; 2:13; 4:1, 2; 6:2, 6, 34; 8:31; 9:31; 10:1; 11:17; 12:14, 35;

combined in 4:1; 6:2, 34. Mark frames the prediction with the redactional sentence: καὶ παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει (8:32a). Two other Markan passages (2:2 and 4:33) contain the phrase τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει. Especially 4:33 is important for understanding what Mark is saying here. The term παρρησίᾳ in 8:32a contrasts sharply with παραβολαῖς in 4:33. Mark is contrasting the open teaching Jesus has just given in 8:31 with the obscure teaching in parables.[1]

It is now possible to evaluate the development that has taken place in Mark's treatment of the messianic secret. Whereas before 8:27 Jesus consistently suppressed the question of who he is, after 8:27 he confronts the disciples with the question. Before 8:27 he taught in obscure parables; after 8:27 he teaches openly that the Son of Man must suffer. We are still very much within the framework of the secret, however. The disciples are silenced. The revelation of who Jesus is may not be made public. We will also see that the disciples are as uncomprehending after 8:27 as they were before.

Mark returns to the theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples immediately after the first passion prediction. Verses 32b-33 are difficult. It is commonly held that v. 33b contains a very old saying that may even be an authentic Jesus saying. Schweizer states, "...there is no evidence of any opposition to Peter in the church of the first century;

14:49. All are redactional except 12:14. See Schweizer, "Anmerkungen," pp. 95-96; Kee, Community, p. 53.

[1]See above, pp. 41-42.

therefore vs. 33 could not have arisen in that kind of situation, but must be an authentic saying of Jesus."[1] However, there are difficulties with this view. It is not easy to find a Sitz im Leben for this isolated saying. We must reject the suggestion of Hahn and Dinkler that v. 33b originally followed Peter's confession in v. 29 and expressed a radical rejection of the title "Messiah" by Jesus for it is impossible to explain why the church so quickly settled on the title "Christ" if Jesus had explictly rejected it.[2] Does v. 33b make sense as an isolated saying? Would it have been handed on without a situation that made it meaningful?[3] Besides we can see the hand of Mark in vv. 32b-33. The verb ἐπιτιμάω appears in both verses. Mark has already used it redactionally in v. 30. It is likely that Mark has borrowed the verb from v. 30 to show the strong opposition of Peter in v. 32b. The use of ἤρξατο confirms this.[4] Verse 33a is also probably from Mark. It is awkward, disturbing the context by introducing the disciples into a scene that opposes Peter and Jesus.

---

[1]Eduard Schweizer, The Good News According to Mark, trans. Donald H. Madwig (Atlanta: John Knox, 1970), p. 165.

[2]Ferdinand Hahn, The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity, trans. Harold Knight and George Ogg (London: Lutterworth, 1969), pp. 223-38; Erich Dinkler, "Petrusbekenntnis und Satanswort: Das Problem der Messianität Jesu," Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80.Geburtstag, ed. Erich Dinkler with Hartwig Thyen (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964), pp. 127-53.

[3]Horstmann (p. 9) also contends that the saying is pre-Easter tradition, but she does not suggest a Sitz im Leben.

[4]See above, p. 24, n. 1.

It is a concern of Mark, however, to show Peter as the spokesman of the group of disciples.[1] The command to silence was addressed to all the disciples after Peter's confession. The double participle is a common feature of Mark's style.[2] Mark used ἐπιστραφείς of Jesus in 5:30. He uses ἰδών frequently applied to Jesus. When he does, he then gives Jesus' reaction to what he has seen, and in two instances besides the present one Jesus reacts with a saying that closes a discussion.[3] Even the Satan saying is not without signs of Markan redaction. The phrase ὀπίσω μου comes from Mark who introduces it here in anticipation of its use in 8:34.[4] It is possible that Mark also wrote the imperative ὕπαγε. Mark uses the imperative of ὑπάγω regularly. While it is most frequent in traditional dismissal formulas after accounts of miracles, Mark does use the plural redactionally in 16:7.[5] In Mark's view Jesus is telling Peter to get behind him, to be a disciple.[6] This is the theme of the sayings in 8:34-9:1 which Mark has placed here to show the connection between the passion prediction and discipleship. Mark is announcing the theme in v. 33. The ὅτι clause could also come from Mark.

---

[1]Horstmann, p. 12. [2]Neirynck, pp. 82-84.

[3]10:14; 12:34. See Denaux, pp. 210-11, n. 42.

[4]Horstmann, pp. 26-27.

[5]Turner, "Usage," 29 (1927-28): 287-88; Schenke, Auferstehungsverkündigung, pp. 43-46.

[6]Compare 1:17, 20. See Horstmann, p. 27; Nützel, Verklärungserzählung, p. 197, n. 32.

He likes the οὐκ...ἀλλά construction.[1] Furthermore, the strong antithesis between God and men that is expressed here occurs elsewhere in Mark:

ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ
κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων. (7:8)[2]

ὃ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω. (10:9)

παρὰ ἀνθρώποις ἀδύνατον, ἀλλ' οὐ παρὰ θεῷ... (10:27)

τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ Ἰωάννου ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἦν ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; (11:30)

οὐ γὰρ βλέπεις εἰς πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπων,
ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἀληθείας τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ διδάσκεις (12:14)

Even the double use of the neuter plural of the article has a Markan parallel: τὰ Καίσαρος ἀπόδοτε Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ (12:17). That the passion is God's will has been brought out by the δεῖ in v. 31, so the ὅτι clause fits perfectly into the Markan context. We propose as an hypothesis that Mark composed vv. 32b-33 himself.[3] In both verses he has used ἐπιτιμάω which he used redactionally in v. 30 to express strong opposition. It is possible that the address for Peter was drawn from Q. There is a fascinating parallel in Matthew's version of the Q temptation story. In Matt 4:10 Jesus banishes Satan with the words ὕπαγε Σατανᾶ. What makes the parallel doubly attractive is the fact that the Q temptation story is also dealing with the correct understanding of Jesus'

---

[1]Neirynck, pp. 90-94. [2]Compare 7:9, 13.

[3]The fact that Mark composed a passage himself does not rule out the possibility that he may be reworking a tradition. However, in the present case there does not seem to be any evidence pointing to a tradition about a word of Jesus rebuking Peter in this way. On the general problem of Markan composition and tradition, see Taylor, pp. 82-85.

way.[1] However, it is not certain that Q contained the words as they are not found in the Lukan parallel. It is possible that Matthew introduced the words into the temptation story, borrowing them from Mark 8:33.[2] It is not necessary for our purposes that Mark may have found the address in Q. He could have taken the name of the arch adversary from traditions that he incorporated into his gospel and used it as an address for Peter to show strong opposition on Jesus' part to Peter's rebuke.[3] Mark has drawn the disciples into the scene to underline Peter's function as spokesman, and he has expressed the opposition to the passion in the God-men antithesis familiar to him. Confirmation of this hypothesis is found in the redactional frames of the second and third passion predictions.[4] Each of the three passion predictions is accompanied by the theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples.[5]

Mark has brought together in the Caesarea Philippi pericope his revelation motif (vv. 29, 31, 32a), the secrecy

---

[1]Denaux (pp. 210-11, n. 42) mentions the possibility that Mark is redacting a Q saying.

[2]If Matthew did introduce the words in the Q temptation story, he created a parallel in his gospel between Jesus' rebuke to Satan (Matt 4:10) and his rebuke to Peter (Matt 16:23).

[3]Compare the use of "Satan" in 1:13; 3:23, 26; 4:15.

[4]Compare 9:30-31a, 32, 33-35; 10:32, 35-45.

[5]Although we are only concerned here with noting the recurrence of the theme of the lack of understanding, the pattern after each prediction also includes further instruction on discipleship. See Norman Perrin, "Towards an Interpretation of the Gospel of Mark," Christology and a Modern Pilgrimage: A Discussion with Norman Perrin, ed. Hans Dieter Betz (n.p.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1971), pp. 11-12.

motif (v. 30), and the lack of understanding motif (vv. 32b-33).[1] There has been a twofold development in the portrayal of the messianic secret. Jesus confronts the disciples with the question he has up to now suppressed, and he teaches openly that the Son of Man must suffer. The secret is not revealed, however. Jesus commands silence after Peter's confession. The theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples continues. Peter's confession, "You are the Christ," is deceptive. It seems to indicate a decisive breakthrough in the disciples' understanding. However, Mark immediately returns to his theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples. The breakthrough is only apparent; the disciples are as uncomprehending after Caesarea Philippi as they were before.

Mark develops the theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples in the Transfiguration pericope (9:2-8). Peter responds to the transformation of Jesus into a light figure and the appearance of Elijah and Moses with the suggestion that they build three tents, one for Jesus, one for Moses, and one for Elijah (9:5). Mark comments: "For he did not know what he was answering, for they were afraid" (9:6). This verse is redactional. It is a double γάρ clause;[2] it does not carry the narrative forward but rather comments on it;[3] and it expresses the typically Markan theme of the lack

---

[1] Strecker, "Messiasgeheimnistheorie," pp. 100-101.

[2] See above, p. 20, n. 2.

[3] Nützel, Verklärungserzählung, p. 137.

of understanding of the disciples and their fear.[1] The comment in 9:6 shows that Peter's suggestion in 9:5 means that he has not grasped the meaning of the scene.[2] The disciples have not understood the Transfiguration. The revelation of Jesus as a light figure does not enlighten them. They remain uncomprehending.

When Jesus and the three disciples are descending from the mountain of the Transfiguration, he commands them to tell no one what they have seen except when the Son of Man has risen from the dead (9:9). The verse is from the hand of Mark. The genitive absolute[3] and the use of διαστελλόμαι with ἵνα[4] are Markan. The reference to the Son of Man's rising from the dead does not fit the context of the Transfiguration which does not mention the resurrection; it does fit the larger Markan context which includes the first passion prediction (8:31) which does mention the resurrection of the Son of Man.[5] The command also fits into the context of the messianic secret. It is a concern of Mark to silence the revelation of who Jesus is. The command forbids the disciples to spread the revelation they have received on the mountain. Since the command does

---

[1] 4:41; 6:51b-52. See Nützel, Verklärungserzählung, p. 138.

[2] Horstmann, p. 81.

[3] Similar genitive absolutes that Mark a new beginning and are certainly redactional occur at 5:21; 6:54; 10:17. See Nützel, Verklärungserzählung, pp. 152-53.

[4] See above, p. 25, n. 6.

[5] Nützel, Verklärungserzählung, pp. 156-59.

not make sense except within the framework of the gospel as a whole, it is redactional.

This is the only command to silence in Mark's gospel that has a time limit.[1] Wrede saw this time limit as the key that unlocks the messianic secret.[2] The resurrection was the turning point. It was only after the resurrection that the disciples began to believe in Jesus' messiahship. Jesus' earthly ministry was not messianic. However, the church began to project Jesus' messiahship back into the account of his earthly life. The messianic secret was a transitional concept of the church which attempted to reconcile the original belief that Jesus became Messiah at the resurrection and the later view that he was Messiah during his ministry. Wrede was mistaken on several counts. There never was a non-messianic tradition about Jesus' ministry.[3] From the beginning the tradition was thoroughly messianic. Also the secret is not pre-Markan. In our investigations so far we have found that the passages that constitute the data of the messianic secret are redactional.[4] The only exception to this, the command

---

[1]The sayings in 4:21-22 also imply a time limit.

[2]Wrede, Secret, pp. 37, 67-68.

[3]Hans Conzelmann, "Gegenwart und Zukunft in der synoptischen Tradition," ZTK 54 (1957): 293-95; Strecker, "Messiasgeheimnistheorie," p. 90; Lewis S. Hay, "Mark's Use of the Messianic Secret," JAAR 35 (1967): 18.

[4]It remains a theoretical possibility that the traditions Mark used contained a reminiscence that Jesus was reluctant to accept categorizations or that he shunned publicity. However, we have no evidence for such a tradition. The data of the messianic secret point to Mark as the originator of the secrecy motif.

in 1:25, had a different function in the pre-Markan tradition and was reinterpreted by Mark in the sense of his messianic secret in the redactional summaries 1:32-34 and 3:7-12. Wrede was also mistaken about the limit of the secret. The secret is not disclosed for the first time at the resurrection but in the depths of the passion in 14:62.[1] Who Jesus is is only fully revealed in the passion.

What, then, is the meaning of the command in 9:9 with its time limit? The resurrection in Mark is the time of the regathering of the community. The disciples who were scattered in the passion (14:27, 50) are reassembled by Jesus at the resurrection (14:28; 16:7). After the resurrection there is the worldwide preaching of the gospel (13:10; 14:9). It is then that what the disciples have seen and heard[2] on the mountain will be told. The full revelation of Jesus in the crucifixion will make possible the confession of Jesus as the Son of God (15:39, compare 9:7).

The reaction of the disciples to Jesus' command again shows their lack of comprehension: "And they kept the word, discussing with one another what the resurrection from the dead was" (9:10).[3] We might tend to think from 8:32b-33 that

---

[1]Norman Perrin, "The High Priest's Question and Jesus' Answer (Mark 14:61-62)," The Passion in Mark: Studies on Mark 14-16, ed. Werner H. Kelber (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), pp. 82, 89.

[2]The words of the voice from the cloud are certainly included in ἃ εἶδον; see Nützel, Verklärungserzählung, p. 156.

[3]Since 9:10 refers back to the redactional verse 9:9, it is also redactional.

the lack of understanding of the disciples centers only on their inability to comprehend and accept the passion. The two passages 9:6 and 9:10 show that they also do not understand Jesus' glory or the resurrection.[1] Throughout Mark's gospel the disciples do not understand Jesus, his way of suffering, or the future glory.

In an addition (9:28-29) to the story of the cure of the possessed boy, the disciples ask Jesus privately why they could not expel the demon. The entire passage is redactional as is shown by the numerous Markan elements: οἶκος,[2] κατ' ἰδίαν,[3] ἐπηρωτάω,[4] interrogative ὅτι,[5] δύναμαι,[6] double statement.[7] This is a variation on the theme of public instruction and private explanation that Mark has used in 4:3-20 and 7:14-23. There is no teaching in public, but the disciples ask in private about something that happened in public.

The second passion prediction like the first is framed by Markan statements (9:30-31a, 32) that characterize it as

---

[1]Perrin, Redaction Criticism, p. 9.

[2]See above, p. 43, n. 7. [3]See above, p. 26, n. 2.

[4]See above, p. 35, n. 1.

[5]Hawkins, pp. 13, 35; Turner, "Usage," 27 (1925-26): 58-62; F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. and rev. Robert W. Funk (Chicago and London: University of Chicago, 1961), §300 (2); C. F. D. Moule, An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1963), p. 159; Snoy, "Rédaction," p. 472, n. 304.

[6]See above, p. 39, n. 7. [7]Neirynck, p. 89.

private teaching and emphasize the lack of understanding of the disciples. Κἀκεῖθεν,[1] ἐξέρχομαι,[2] Γαλιλαία,[3] διδάσκω,[4] the explanatory γάρ clause,[5] and the link formula καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς betray Mark's hand. The secrecy motif is present in v. 30b, "And he did not want anyone to know it." In the concluding phrase Mark states that they did not know the word and they were afraid to ask him. The verb ἠγνόουν expresses the lack of understanding of the disciples. This is further emphasized by ἐφοβοῦντο. In Mark fear is equated with lack of faith. This is brought out after the stilling of the storm. Jesus asks the disciples: τί δειλοί ἐστε; οὔπω ἔχετε πίστιν; (4:40). Mark then adds: καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν (4:41). This same fear is present in the walking on the water (6:50-51) and in the Transfiguration (9:6). It is also present at the end of the gospel in the account of the empty tomb (16:8). The key to understanding the motif is found in Jesus' words to Jairus: μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευε (5:36). Mark opposes faith and fear. The disciples react to the passion prediction with fear, that is to say, with unbelief.[7]

In the discussion on divorce (10:1-12) we again find

---

[1]Mark likes adverbs in -θεν. See Neirynck, pp. 75-76.

[2]See above, p. 23, n. 4.

[3]1:9, 14, 16, 28, 39; 3:7; 6:21; 7:31; 9:30; 14:28; 15:41; 16:7. All except 6:21 are redactional. See Marxsen, pp. 54-116; Schenke, Studien, pp. 442-59.

[4]See above, p. 50, n. 4. [5]See above, p. 20, n. 2.

[6]See above, p. 37, n. 2.

[7]Snoy, "Rédaction," pp. 433-39.

the Markan theme of public teaching and private explanation. The introductory verse (10:1) is redactional. The adverb ἐκεῖθεν,[1] the historic presents συνπορεύονται[2] and especially ἔρχεται,[3] πάλιν,[4] and διδάσκω[5] are Markan. The double geographical reference is also from Mark.[6] It marks a station on Jesus' way and thus fits into the geographical framework of the second half of the gospel. The crowds are introduced here as a foil to the disciples in 10:10 just as the crowd was introduced in 7:14 as a foil to the disciples in 7:17. Here, too, the verse that describes the disciples' question is Markan. The vocabulary is entirely Markan: εἰς used where we would expect ἐν,[7] οἰκία as a secret place,[8] πάλιν, and ἐπηρωτάω.[9] Again although there is some slight development in thought in the private instruction of Jesus, Mark is mainly interested in the fact that Jesus gives private instruction and not the content. It is within the community that Jesus gives special revelation. The disciples, though, never understand.

The introduction to the third passion prediction

---

[1]Redactional at 6:1; 7:24; 10:1. See Grässer, p. 9.

[2]Hawkins, pp. 143-49.

[3]Statistics (ἔρχεται and ἔρχονται): 3 24 1 16 0. See Hawkins, pp. 12, 34.

[4]See above, p. 43, n. 2. [5]See above, p. 50, n. 4.

[6]Neirynck, pp. 94-96.

[7]Turner, "Usage," 26 (1924-25): 14-20.

[8]See above, p. 43, n. 7. [9]See above, p. 35, n. 1.

(10:32-33a) comes totally from the hand of Mark. The vocabulary and construction are Markan: προάγω,[1] θαμβέομαι,[2] πάλιν, ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ,[3] the periphrastic imperfect,[4] the repetition of "going up to Jerusalem,"[5] and ἤρξατο with the infinitive.[6] The fear of the disciples recalls the frame of the second passion prediction. Mark is again stressing the unbelief of the disciples. The disciples are strongly contrasted with Jesus who is here going ahead of them (προάγων, compare 14:28; 16:7). Jesus has fully accepted God's will; the disciples are unbelieving.

Peter's confession does not bring with it understanding. The theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples continues in this section. What is new in the discipleship section is that Jesus confronts the disciples with the question, "But you, who do you say I am?" They are forced to take a stand on the question that kept rising in the first half of the gospel but was continually suppressed by Jesus. In this section also Jesus no longer teaches obscurely in parables but openly teaches that he must suffer. The disciples, though, do not understand this teaching. Each of the three great passion predictions that dominate the section is framed by

---

[1] Statistics: 6 5 1 0 4.

[2] Statistics: 0 3 0 0 0; compare ἐκθαμβέομαι: 0 4 0 0 0.

[3] Redactional at 8:27; 9:33, 34; 10:32, 52 (compare 10:17). See Luz, pp. 24-25; Kelber, p. 69.

[4] See above, p. 45, n. 7. [5] Neirynck, pp. 114-15.

[6] See above, p. 24, n. 1.

passages that bring out the theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples. Jesus gives further instruction on the nature of discipleship but to no avail.[1] The disciples are given a glimpse of who Jesus is in the confession of Peter and in the Transfiguration, but they remain uncomprehending. Not only do they not understand who Jesus is, but they also do not understand who they are or what it means to be Jesus' disciple. This section brings out forcefully the ecclesiological aspect of the messianic secret. Who Jesus is has implications for the community. If the Son of Man's life and death reverses all human values, then the community must also follow in this way. Instead of seeking honor, the disciple must serve. Instead of possessing riches, the disciple must be poor. Anyone who wants to save his life must lose it. The disciples, though, are completely incapable of understanding who Jesus is or the nature of discipleship.

The Jerusalem Section

Burkill contends that the messianic secret is subjected to a strain in the Jerusalem section (11:1-13:37) that it cannot bear.[2] The result is that the secret is disclosed. However, a study of the relevant passages will not substantiate this. There is a tension between the revelation of who Jesus

---

[1]The fact that after the disciples have shown their lack of understanding Jesus gives further instruction should not lead us to think that then finally the disciples understand. A key passage in this regard is 8:21. After reproaching them Jesus says, "Do you not yet understand?" Their failure to answer implies that they do not. See above, p. 48.

[2]Burkill, Revelation, pp. 188-209.

is and the suppression of the revelation, but this tension is in evidence throughout the gospel and is not just present in this section.

As Jesus is leaving Jericho, the blind Bartimaeus cries out, "Son of David, Jesus, have pity on me" (10:47).[1] However, the secret is not broken, because the crowd silences Bartimaeus: καὶ ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ πολλοὶ ἵνα σιωπήσῃ· ὁ δὲ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἔκραζεν...(10:48). The wording of the command is similar to the wording of the other commands and is Markan.[2] Ἐπιτιμάω occurs in the commands in 1:25; 3:12 (with ἵνα); and 8:30 (with ἵνα). Σιωπάω is a Markan word,[3] and it is parallel to φιμόω in the command to the sea and wind in 4:39, a command that is closely related to the commands to the demons. Bartimaeus' failure to obey the command is similar to the failure of the leper in 1:45 and the failure of the crowds in 7:36 to obey the commands. The command to Bartimaeus is striking. It is the only command to silence that does not come from Jesus. Although this is a miracle story, the command resembles the commands addressed to the demons. This is the only place where the person asking for a cure addresses Jesus

---

[1]The Bartimaeus episode (10:46-52) is actually the conclusion of the discipleship section. However, at the same time it introduces the Jerusalem section. It is really a transition pericope. See I. de la Potterie, p. 140. We include it here because of its bearing on Burkill's thesis.

[2]Christoph Burger, Jesus als Davidssohn: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, vol. 98 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), pp. 60-61.

[3]Statistics: 2 5 2 0 1.

with a messianic title. This command is one more piece of evidence that the commands after the miracles cannot be artificially separated from the commands addressed to the demons. This command is another example of how the commands can function as a literary device to enable Mark to impart information to his readers. The title "Son of David" is important for Mark in the Jerusalem section. He uses the technique of the command to introduce the title without breaking the messianic secret. In this way he prepares for the entrance to Jerusalem (11:1-11) and the "Son of David" question (12:35-37).[1]

There is submerged messianism in the account of the approach of Jesus to Jerusalem. However, the secret is not broken here either. The crowd cries out, "Blessed is the coming kingdom of our father David" (11:10). The direct reference is to the kingdom not to the coming Messiah, so the secret is intact.

According to Burkill the strain on the secret is so great in the account of the parable of the wicked tenants (12:1-12) that the secret is broken and there is a temporary disclosure of Jesus' messiahship.[2] However, the messiahship is only indirectly indicated, not openly proclaimed. What

---

[1]Minette de Tillesse (p. 41) counts eight or nine explicit injunctions to silence of which three (or four) are in accounts of miracles (1:43-44; 5:43; 7:36; and perhaps 8:26), three are in exorcisms (1:25; 1:34; and 3:12), and two are addressed to disciples after privileged manifestations of messianic glory (8:30 and 9:9). The command in 8:26 should be counted, and to these should be added 5:8 and 10:48 making a total of eleven commands to secrecy in Mark.

[2]Burkill, Revelation, pp. 201-203.

Jesus' opponents realize is not that he is the Messiah but that the parable is directed against them. Mark does not here maintain his parable theory, but we have seen in 4:33 that Mark does not maintain the theory consistently. This does not mean that the messianic secret has been disclosed.

The eschatological discourse is the last example of private instruction of the disciples in the gospel. The entire introduction of the discourse is redactional.[1] Here for the last time we find the Markan κατ' ἰδίαν (13:3). The four disciples who were first called (1:16-20, compare 1:29) here receive Jesus' teaching on the time and the sign of the end. The framework is somewhat artificial as it is evident in the discourse that the audience is wider than the four.[2]

In general Mark uses the theme of private instruction for two reasons. First, it brings out the privilege of the disciples. Within the community there is special revelation, even the ultimate revelation ("to you the mystery of the kingdom of God is given"). Second, it highlights the lack of understanding of the disciples. Despite the fact that Jesus lavishes special, private instruction on the disciples, they never understand.

The Passion

During the passion the theme of the lack of understanding is deepened further. The passion opens with the

---

[1]Lambrecht, Redaktion, pp. 68-91; Pesch, Naherwartungen, pp. 83-106.

[2]Compare especially 13:14, 37.

Jewish leaders at a loss as to how to capture Jesus (14:1-2). Their difficulty is overcome by the betrayal of one of Jesus' own disciples (14:10-11). Mark characterizes Judas as ὁ εἷς τῶν δώδεκα (14:10), indicating subtly that not only Judas, but all the disciples are implicated in the passion. This is brought out forcefully in two dialogues of Jesus and the disciples (14:18-20 and 14:27-31).[1] In the prediction of the betrayal, Jesus emphasizes that the betrayer is "one of you" (14:18). Mark does not direct his attention so much on Judas as on the circle of the twelve. Judas is not mentioned by name, and the characterizations of the betrayer like the phrase ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ (14:18) can apply to all of the disciples. They all say with some self-assurance μήτι ἐγώ; (14:19). Jesus does not answer by identifying Judas but rather insists that the betrayer is εἷς τῶν δώδεκα (14:20).[2] After the supper Jesus and the disciples go out to the Mount of Olives. There Jesus predicts that all will be scandalized. Mark is here interpreting the flight of the disciples (14:50) and Peter's denial (14:54, 66-72). The passive of σκανδαλίζω indicates that the flight and the denial are a falling into unbelief.[3] The disciples give up their discipleship.[4] The motif of the lack of understanding of the disciples climaxes

---

[1]Schenke, Studien, pp. 203-237, 370-423, shows that both passages are redactional.

[2]Ibid., pp. 210, 213, 220, 225, 231, 236-37.

[3]4:17; 6:3. Compare 9:42, 43, 45, 47.

[4]Schenke, Studien, p. 431.

here.[1]

In the Gethsemane pericope (14:32-42) we have the last occurrence of the motif of the separation of three disciples. The closest followers of Jesus fail.[2] They sleep, ignoring Jesus' powerful warning at the end of the eschatological discourse to watch (13:33-37).[3] When Jesus comes to them the second time and finds them asleep, Mark comments, "And they did not know what to answer him" (14:40). This comment, like the close parallel 9:6, expresses the complete failure of the disciples. They did not comprehend the Transfiguration; here they are unable to find an excuse for their inability to watch.[4]

At the arrest all of the disciples flee (14:50). Peter follows, but only from a distance (14:54) and only to deny Jesus. Mark frames the trial before the Sanhedrin and Jesus' confession (14:55-65) with the two parts of Peter's denial (14:54, 66-72).[5] He does this to bring the two events into the closest proximity to each other temporally and spatially. At the same time that Jesus is making the confession that costs him his life, Peter is below in the courtyard (κάτω ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ) denying him.[6]

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 426-32. [2]Ibid., p. 556.

[3]Compare especially 13:36. See Schenke, Studien, p. 557.

[4]Ibid., pp. 535-36.

[5]Ernst von Dobschütz, "Zur Erzählerkunst des Markus," ZNW 27 (1968): 193-98; Key, Community, pp. 54-56.

[6]Rudolf Pesch, "Die Verleugnung des Petrus: Eine Studie zu Mk 14,54.66-72 (und Mk 14,26-31)," Neues Testament und Kirche:

In the trial itself, Jesus' enemies are not able to convict him. The trial is indecisive until the high priest asks, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed One?" (14:61). Jesus answer, "I am; and you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Power and coming with the clouds of heaven" (14:62). The messianic secret is disclosed.[1] Jesus himself breaks the secret with his confession that costs him his life. Who Jesus is is proclaimed by Jesus himself before his enemies at the time when they have him in their power. Jesus repeats the confession before Pilate (15:2). His σὺ λέγεις is a reserved "yes."[2] Now the secret is out. The enemies of Jesus can even use it to mock him at the foot of the cross (15:32). At the foot of the cross, too, a gentile centurion confesses, "Truly this man was God's Son" (15:39). No disciple has penetrated to the foot of the cross to make the confession; the privilege belongs to a gentile soldier. The messianic secret is revealed not at the resurrection as Wrede thought, but in the depths of the passion. It is when Jesus is stripped of all human support, when he is completely helpless and in the power of his enemies, when his whole life

---

Für Rudolf Schnackenburg, ed. Joachim Gnilka (Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1974), p. 45.

[1]Perrin, "Question," pp. 82, 89.

[2]Mauer states that 14:62 is the only place in Mark where Jesus openly states who and what he is. See Christian Mauer, "Das Messiasgeheimnis des Markusevangeliums," NTS 14 (1967-68): 519. But the σὺ λέγεις is also an affirmation. See Ludger Schenke, Der gekreuzigte Christus: Versuch einer literarkritischen und traditionsgeschichtlichen Bestimmung der vormarkinischen Passionsgeschichte, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, vol. 69 (Stuttgart: KBW, 1974), p. 63.

has been destroyed, it is then that he can reveal who he is. The secret is now held by the circumstances of the confession. When everything negates who Jesus is, then he confesses himself. It is when he is crucified that it is apparent what it is to confess him as the Christ. It is when he dies that he is revealed as God's Son. The final revelation is itself a mystery. Why a crucified Christ? The answer is in God's mysterious will. The resurrection will bring no new revelation.

Neither will the resurrection bring understanding to the disciples. There is no hint in Mark's gospel that the disciples will understand at the resurrection. The command in 9:9 concerns the proclamation of Jesus' sonship. There is no indication that the disciples will understand.[1] In the account of the empty tomb (16:1-8), the young man tells the women, "But go, tell his disciples and Peter that he goes before you into Galilee; there you will see him as he told you" (16:7). This verse is redactional. It corresponds closely to 14:28, and there is even an explicit reference to this verse in the phrase καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν. Since the verse looks beyond the pericope to the context of the gospel as a whole, it is redactional.[2] The verse also refers back to 10:32 and it is here that the interpretation must begin.[3] The movement in Mark's gospel is from Galilee to Jerusalem. Jesus begins his ministry in Galilee (1:14; compare 1:28, 39; 3:7). His way leads through Galilee (9:30) to the cross in

---

[1]Ambrozic, pp. 29-30. [2]Horstmann, p. 129.

[3]Ibid., p. 131.

Jerusalem (10:32-34). Jesus in full conformity with God's will goes before the disciples to Jerusalem, and they follow in unbelief (10:32). Here, at the end of the gospel, Jesus reverses the way. He leads the disciples back to the beginning, back to Galilee.[1] It is there that Jesus first preached the in-breaking of the kingdom (1:14-15). It is there that the disciples were first called by the sea of Galilee (1:16-20). It is there that they witnessed his miracles and the controversies. It is there that he taught them. It is there that the question first surfaced, "Who is this man...?" (4:41). It is in Galilee that the trip up to Jerusalem began. Jesus is here going before his disciples back to the beginning.[2] The women's reaction to the young man's words is in the redactional sentence: καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπαν· ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ (16:8b).[3] This verse refers back to v. 7 and together with it comes from Mark. The reaction of the women is fear. Mark ends his gospel on the note of unbelief. The theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples continues after the resurrection.[4] Who Jesus is is a secret that cannot be understood.

---

[1]The words of the young man point to a resurrection appearance, not to the parousia. See Robert H. Stein, "A Short Note on Mark xiv.28 and xvi.7," NTS 20 (1974): 445-52.

[2]See further Herman Waetjen, "The Ending of Mark and the Gospel's Shift in Eschatology," Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute 4 (1965): 124.

[3]For literary parallels to the ending, see P. W. van der Horst, "Can a Book End with ΓΑΡ? A Note on Mark xvi.8," JTS 23 (1972): 121-24.

[4]The women are portrayed as disciples. Compare 15:40-41.

Conclusions

The passages that form the data of the messianic secret are redactional. Therefore the secret is a Markan theme, and all attempts to place it in the pre-Markan tradition or even in the historical ministry of Jesus are incorrect. Since the secret is a redactional theme of Mark and because the different aspects of the secret show interconnections, the data of the secret must be given a unified interpretation.

Mark introduces the messianic secret in the first half of the gospel. Jesus silences the cries of the demons. The demons know who Jesus is, and their cries are revelations. The revelations, though, are suppressed. The demons are silenced because they know who Jesus is (1:34). The miracles also raise the question of who Jesus is. Because they do, they are also suppressed by Jesus' commands. The witnesses are ordered not to tell anyone about them. Even Jesus' teaching attempts to conceal his person. He teaches in obscure parables so that the outsiders will not understand. The disciples, on the other hand, are given special instruction, but they never seem to understand. Who Jesus is remains a mystery to them. All of the elements of the messianic secret have a Christological point. They all revolve around the question "Who is Jesus?"

At the beginning of the second half of the gospel Mark himself formulates the question that is the content of the messianic secret. Jesus addresses the disciples: ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; "But you, who do you say I am?" (8:29). The movement of the first half of the gospel climaxes

in this question.

The second half of the gospel moves from this question to the passion in Jerusalem. From this point on Jesus teaches openly that he must suffer. During this second half of the gospel the disciples continue to react to Jesus with incomprehension and unbelief. In the passion they abandon Jesus. Jesus is left to face the passion alone.

The secret is disclosed in the trial before the Sanhedrin. At the climax of the trial is the question of Jesus' identity. But here the question is not suppressed. Jesus clearly affirms that he is the Christ, the Son of the Blessed One. The affirmation of Jesus becomes the basis for his execution. For disclosing the secret, Jesus is crucified. The secret, though, continues. It is now held by the passion. In the crucifixion is the full revelation of who Jesus is, but the revelation is mysterious.

The theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples continues to the end of the gospel. The women flee for they were afraid. The gospel ends on the note of unbelief. Who Jesus is remains a secret.

The question, "But you, who do you say I am?," stands at the center of Mark. Basically the same question of Jesus' identity stands at the climax of the passion, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed One?" To further probe this question we must now examine Peter's response, "You are the Christ" (8:29).

CHAPTER II

CHRIST

Peter's confession, "You are the Christ" (8:29), comes as something of a surprise. Up to this point in Mark "Christ" has appeared only in the opening verse of the gospel. To understand the confession we must examine the use of "Christ" in Mark.

"Christ" is used as a designation for Jesus six times in Mark (1:1; 8:29; 9:41; 12:35; 14:61; 15:32).[1] It is used absolutely with the article in 8:29; 12:35; 14:61; 15:32. It is used without the article in 9:41 and as part of the double name "Jesus Christ" in 1:1. The title is applied to Jesus in 8:29; 14:61; and 15:32. Jesus accepts the title in 14:62. Jesus uses the title in 9:41 and 12:35 with an implied, but indirect reference to himself. In addition the word is used to refer to false Christs in 13:21. The titles "Son of David" (10:47, 48; 12:35; see also 11:10), "King of the Jews" (15:2, 9,12, 18, 26), and "King of Israel" (15:32) should be considered along with the title "Christ" because they are linked with the title in two key passages, 12:35 and 15:32.

We will consider first the Jewish and Christian back-

---

[1] Χριστόν is read by some manuscripts at 1:34. However, this is an obvious harmonization with Luke 4:41. The shorter reading of ℵ* A (D) K Δ Π al is to be preferred. See Metzger, p. 75.

ground of the title. Then we will examine the use of "Christ" and "Son of David" in Mark, the trial scene in which Jesus accepts the title "Christ," and the use of the title "King of the Jews" in the passion.

Jewish Messianism

Since we are primarily interested in discovering the meaning of the title "Christ" in Mark, we will mention only the Psalms of Solomon, the Qumran material, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. They give us some picture of contemporary Jewish thought on the Messiah.[1]

The word χριστός occurs four times in the Psalms of Solomon.[2] In Ps. Sol. 17, after praying that God will raise up a king, the son of David, the author states: "...in his days there shall be no unrighteousness in the midst of the people, all shall be holy and their king an anointed of the Lord (καὶ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν χριστὸς κυρίου)" (v. 32). The description means no more than that the king will be a legitimate ruler, an anointed successor of David's line. The king is

---

[1]For a fuller treatment of Jewish messianism, see Walter Grundmann, et al., "χρίω, κτλ.," TDNT, vol. 9, ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1974), pp. 505-527.

[2]The Psalms of Solomon were written around the middle of the first century B.C. in Palestine. Composed originally in Hebrew, they have survived only in Greek and Syriac manuscripts. See Otto Eissfeld, The Old Testament: An Introduction, trans. Peter R. Ackroyd (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), pp. 610-13. For the Greek text, see Alfred Rahlfs, Septuaginta, vol. 2, 9th ed. (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1971), pp. 471-89.

portrayed in terms taken from the Old Testament, and there is an allusion to Nathan's prophecy (2 Sam 7:1-17) in v. 4.[1] In Ps. Sol. 18 the expression approaches the status of a title. In v. 5 the author prays, "May God cleanse Israel against the day of mercy, in blessing, against the day of choice when He brings back His Anointed (εἰς ἡμέραν ἐκλογῆς ἐν ἀνάξει χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ)." The author seems to be referring to a definite future figure. In vv. 6-7 he declares those blessed who will see the goodness the Lord will do "under the rod of chastening of the Anointed of the Lord (ὑπὸ ῥάβδον παιδείας χριστοῦ κυρίου)." The article is not in the text, but it must be supplied in translation. The article is found in the title of the Psalm (ψαλμὸς τῷ Σαλωμών· ἔτι τοῦ χριστοῦ κυρίου); but this may be a later addition. Ps. Sol. 18 refers to the king in terms that approach a title "the Anointed of the Lord."[2] The word χριστός is always qualified. The terms used are "his Anointed" and "Anointed of the Lord." We do not have the absolute usage.[3]

The messianism of the Qumran community underwent some development during the history of the sect. In the Maccabean period (from about 152 B.C. to 110-100 B.C.) there is no evidence of messianic expectation at Qumran. From this period come the Thanksgiving Psalms and the oldest copy of the Manual

---

[1]M. de Jonge, "The Use of the Word 'Anointed' in the Time of Jesus," NT 8 (1966): 134-35.

[2]Ibid., pp. 135-36.

[3]Grundmann, et al., p. 514.

of Discipline ($4QS^e$) which does not contain the section which is found in 1QS 8:15b-9:11.[1]

Beginning with the Hasmonean period (110-100 B.C. to 63 B.C.), the Qumran community expected two Messiahs, a priestly Messiah, the Messiah of Aaron, and a royal Messiah, the Messiah of Israel. The clearest reference is in 1QS 9:10-11: "...they shall be ruled by the original precepts which the men of the community began to use for self-discipline until the coming of the prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel."[2] This passage clearly refers to three eschatological figures, the prophet and two Messiahs. From the same period comes 4QTestim which links several Old Testament passages: Deut 5:28-29 and Deut 18:18-19, alluding to the prophet like Moses; Num 24:15-17 with the two figures, the Star and the Scepter; Deut 33:8-11, the blessing of Levi; and Josh 6:26.[3] Although the exact reference of each quotation is difficult to determine, the same three eschatological figures seem to be alluded to.[4] Also from the same period

---

[1]Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic 'Elect of God' Text from Qumran," Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971), pp. 131-32.

[2]Millar Burrows (ed.), The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, vol. 2, fasc. 2 (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951).

[3]J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," JBL 75 (1956): 182-87; idem, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan, vol. 5 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), pp. 57-60.

[4]Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "'4QTestimonia' and the New Testament," Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971), pp. 82-84.

are the two additions to the Manual of Discipline, 1QSa which refers to a priest and the Messiah of Israel (1QSa 2:11-12, 14, 20) and 1QSb which contains a blessing for the High Priest (1QSb 1:21-3:21) and one for the Prince of the Congregation (1QSb 5:20-29).

Three passages in the Damascus Document refer to "a Messiah of Aaron and Israel" (CD 12:23-13:1; 14:19; 19:10-11), and one to "a Messiah from Aaron and Israel" (CD 20:1). These expressions have been interpreted as referring to one individual.[1] J. Starcky even sees them as an indication that in the Pompeian period (63-37 B.C.) the expectation of two Messiahs was narrowed down to one.[2] It is more likely that the expressions should be interpreted as referring to two figures. First, the Damascus Document probably should not be dated with Starcky in the Pompeian period but around 100 B.C., making it roughly contemporary with 1QS which clearly expects two Messiahs. Furthermore, the expressions "a Messiah of Aaron and Israel" and "a Messiah from Aaron and Israel" are ambiguous and can be understood as referring to two individuals. Finally, what is decisive is the interpretation of Num 24:17 in CD 7:18-20 which mentions two figures: the Star who is the interpretor of the Law, and the Scepter who is the prince of the whole congregation. Starcky identifies the Star with the prophet, but the Star should rather be identified with the eschatological

---

[1]Emil A. Wcela, "The Messiah(s) of Qumran," CBQ 26 (1964): 340-42.

[2]J. Starcky, "Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumran," RB 70 (1963): 495-96.

priest as is clear from T. Levi 18:3. It appears that there never was a narrowing of the messianic expectation to one figure. The fundamental Qumran expectation was of two figures.[1]

In the Herodian period (4 B.C. to A.D. 68) we also find the characteristic belief in two Messiahs. According to 4QFlor 1:11, the Branch of David will arise with the Interpretor of the Law at the end of time.[2] We undoubtedly have another reference to the two Messiahs in this text. In the War Scroll the High Priest figures prominently, while the prince of the whole congregation is mentioned only in passing (1QM 5:1).[3]

The Messiah of Israel is the kingly Messiah, a descendent of David (4QPBless 1:3-4). He may be referred to as "the Messiah" in 1QSa 2:12 although the text is not certain. If this is the correct reading, this would be the earliest example of the absolute use of the term.[4] The Messiah of Aaron is the eschatological high priest. He is ranked above the kingly Messiah in 1QSa 2:11-21 where he takes precedence over the kingly Messiah at the meal.

---

[1]Raymond E. Brown, "J. Starcky's Theory of Qumran Messianic Development," CBQ 28 (1966): 51-57.

[2]J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References," pp. 176-77; idem, "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrasim," JBL 77 (1958): 350-54; idem, Discoveries, pp. 53-57.

[3]E. L. Sukenik (ed.), The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University (Jerusalem: Magnes Press and Hebrew University, 1955), plates 16-34.

[4]Grundmann, et al., p. 518.

The expectation of two Messiahs is also found in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs:

> For the Lord shall raise up from Levi as it were a High-priest, and from Judah as it were a King... (T. Sim. 7:2)
>
> ...love Levi...For to me the Lord gave the kingdom, and to him the priesthood, and He set the kingdom beneath the priesthood. To me He gave the things upon the earth; to him the things in the heavens. (T. Jud. 21:2-3)

As in the Qumran there is dual leadership of the priest and the king.[1] The roots of the idea go back to the Old Testament. Zech 4:14 mentions two "sons of oil," that is "anointed ones," one of which is Zerubbabel and the other the high priest Joshua.[2]

Christian Messianism

The discussion of the Christian concept of the Messiah must start with 1 Cor 15:3b-5:

> Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures
> and he was buried
> and he was raised on the third day according to the scriptures
> and he was seen by Cephas and then by the Twelve.

This formula is traditional. Paul explicitly states this in v. 3, and the form, the style, and the content show that he did not compose it.[3] The title "Christ" is here associated

---

[1]See also T. Reub. 6:7-8, 10-12; T. Levi 2:11; 5:1-2; 8:1-17; 18:1-14; T. Naph. 5:1-4; 8:2; T. Gad 8:1; T. Jos. 19:11; T. Benj. 11:2.

[2]G. R. Beasley-Murray, "The Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," JTS 48 (1947): 1-12; Helmer Ringgren, The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls, trans. Emilie T. Sander (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963), pp. 171-72; José R. Villalón, "Sources vétéro-testamentaires de la doctrine Qumranienne des deux messies," Revue de Qumran 8 (1972-75): 53-63.

[3]Hans Conzelmann, Der erste Brief an die Korinther,

with the death and resurrection.[1] This is a two-part formula. Although the two-part form is not encountered that frequently, there are numerous statements in the Pauline literature that mention one of the saving acts. When only the second part, the resurrection, is mentioned, the form is "God raised him (Jesus or Christ) from the dead."[2] The first part of the formula, referring to the death, has parallels in Rom 5:8; 14:15; 1 Cor 8:11; Gal 2:21 (see also 1 Pet 3:18). The form of the statement is "Christ died for us." The Christological title "Christ" is constant.[3] The association of the title "Christ" and the death and resurrection must have taken place early because the formula was already traditional by the time Paul wrote. The formula emphasizes that both the death and the resurrection were "according to the scriptures." It was evidently very important to the early church to show that what happened in Jesus' death and resurrection was the fulfilment of the scriptures. However, the formula does not exploit the Jewish background of the title "Christ" but instead fills the title with the content of the events that happened in Jesus.

Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, vol. 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), p. 296.

[1]Werner Kramer, Christ, Lord, Son of God, Studies in Biblical Theology, vol. 50, trans. Brian Hardy (London: SCM, 1966), pp. 19-20.

[2]Rom 10:9, "God raised him from the dead"; 1 Thes 1:10, "whom he raised from the dead--Jesus"; see also Rom 7:4; 8:11; 1 Cor 15:12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20. See Kramer, pp. 20-26.

[3]Kramer, pp. 27, 39; Schenke, Der gekreuzigte Christus, p. 63.

What were central to the early church were not Jewish messianic expectations but the events of Jesus' death and resurrection.[1] Where Christ is used in a more general sense, more in tune with Jewish expectations, then there is more than likely later Christian theologizing at work. The content of the Christ-predicate is determined by the crucifixion and the resurrection and only minimally by a fixed concept of the Messiah.[2] Characteristic of Christian messianism is the absolute usage ὁ Χριστός.[3] Χριστός without the article is also very common.[4]

Christ in Mark

The first place where the title appears in Mark is in the very first verse: "Beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ" (1:1).[5] The punctuation is disputed. If a full stop is placed at the end of the verse and a new sentence begun with v. 2, then v. 1 becomes a title, either for the entire gospel or for the first part of the gospel. This position was argued by Lohmeyer who cited Prov 1:1; Eccl 1:1; Cant 1:1;

---

[1]Nils Alstrup Dahl, "Der gekreuzigte Messias," Der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus: Beiträge zum Christusverständnis in Forschung und Verkündigung, ed. Kelmut Ristow and Karl Matthiae, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961), p. 160.

[2]Dahl, pp. 160-61; Kramer, pp. 43-44.

[3]See, for example, 1 Cor 1:13; 10:4; 11:3; 12:12; Grundmann, et al., p. 527.

[4]See, for example, Rom 5:6, 7; 6:4, 9; 8:10; 10:4; 14:9; Grundmann, et al., pp. 540-41.

[5]On the reading υἱοῦ θεοῦ, see Chapter III below.

and especially Hos 1:2 LXX as parallels.[1] Gerhard Arnold argues that this interpretation is not possible. The first three examples cited by Lohmeyer do not contain ἀρχή and the fourth is not the title of the book. Arnold further argues that καθὼς γέγραπται never stands first in a sentence in the New Testament but is always bound to the preceding clause. He then lists several examples from Greek and Latin literature in which ἀρχή or its equivalent refers to the first stage in the author's exposition.[2] Arnold's arguments are not convincing. There is a parallel to καθὼς γέγραπται at the beginning of a sentence in 1 Cor 2:9. Arnold disputes this example but he bases his argument on reading γάρ in v. 10,[3] and this is by no means certain.[4] Further, if vv. 2-3 are joined to v. 1, then it is necessary to make a new beginning with v. 4. The resulting asyndeton is extremely harsh; in other words, by solving one problem Arnold has created another. The best solution is to place a full stop at the end of v. 1 and to consider the verse a title. The verse is redactional. The formulation is somewhat unusual. Εὐαγγελίου is a Markan word;[5] however, it is usually used absolutely.[6] Furthermore,

---

[1]Ernst Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Markus, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, vol. I-2, 17th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), p. 10.

[2]Gerhard Arnold, "Mk 1,1 und Eröffnungswendungen in griechischen und lateinischen Schriften," ZNW 68 (1977): 123-27.

[3]Ibid., pp. 123-24. [4]Metzger, p. 546.

[5]Statistics: 4 7 0 0 2.

[6]1:15; 8:35; 10:29; 13:10; 14:9 (Statistics: 0 5 0 0 1).

the double name "Jesus Christ" is found only here in Mark. These difficulties do not rule out Markan redaction. Mark finds it necessary in this first mention of the "gospel" to define its content. The double name "Jesus Christ" was felt to be particularly appropriate at the beginning of New Testament books.[1] Ἀρχή is used redactionally at 13:8. These considerations, plus the fact that the verse is most probably the title of Mark's work and thus does not have significance just for this pericope, indicate that it is from Mark's hand.[2] The word "gospel" comes to Mark from the early Christian missionary terminology.[3] This background is clearly reflected in 13:10 and 14:9. The content of the gospel is the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Mark has drawn the earthly ministry of Jesus into this proclamation. The use of ἀρχή shows this. Mark uses the word in reference to creation in 13:19. There it means the temporal beginning of creation.

---

[1]Matt 1:1; Rom 1:1; 1 Cor 1:1; 2 Cor 1:1; Gal 1:1; Phil 1:1; 1 Thes 1:1; 2 Thes 1:1; Col 1:1; Eph 1:1; 1 Tim 1:1; 2 Tim 1:1; Tit 1:1; Jas 1:1; 1 Pet 1:1; Jude 1; Rev 1:1. See Grundmann, et al., p. 541.

[2]Rudolf Pesch, "Anfang des Evangeliums Jesu Christi: Eine Studie zum Prolog des Markusevangelium (Mk 1,1-15)," Der Zeit Jesu: Festschrift für Heinrich Schlier, ed. Günther Bornkamm and Karl Rahner (Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1970), p. 113; Georg Strecker, "Literarkritische Überlegungen zum εὐαγγέλιον-Begriff im Markusevangelium," Neues Testament und Geschichte, ed. Heinrich Baltensweiler and Bo Reicke (Zürich: Theologische Verlag, 1972), pp. 92-93.

[3]Peter Stuhlmacher, Das paulinische Evangelium: I.Vorgeschichte, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, vol. 96 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968), pp. 245-89; Schnackenburg, "Das Evangelium," p. 311.

But in 10:6 it means "origin."[1] The original order of creation is the norm that takes precedence even over the Mosaic law. So, too, the beginning of the gospel is the ministry of Jesus which culminates in the crucifixion in Jerusalem. This is the origin and source of the preaching of the gospel and the norm against which all subsequent preaching must be measured. The genitive Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is an objective genitive.[2] It defines the content of the gospel. The connection of the double name with "gospel" is found only here. The closest parallels are the Pauline uses of εὐαγγελίον τοῦ Χριστοῦ.[3] Although the title "Christ" and the name "Jesus" have been combined into a double name, the element of dignity contained in the title "Christ" is not lost. In this usage of Jesus Christ as a double name, Mark is following the early Christian usage. Although "Christ" became a name, it emphasized the uniqueness and the dignity of Jesus.[4] Mark can still use Christ as a title.

At Caesarea Philippi Jesus first asks the disciples who men say he is (8:27). The answers range over the field of the prophetic: John the Baptist,[5] Elijah, or one of the

---

[1]Schnackenburg, "Das Evangelium," p. 322.

[2]Kramer, p. 52; Schnackenburg, "Das Evangelium," p. 322.

[3]1 Thes 3:2; 1 Cor 9:12; 2 Cor 2:12; 9:13; 10:14; Gal 1:7; Rom 15:19; Phil 1:27. See Kramer, pp. 50-55.

[4]Grundmann writes of Paul's usage: "As a second proper name Χριστός guarantees the particularity and integrity of the name 'Jesus.' Hence the element of dignity is imported into the proper name by it." Grundmann, et al., p. 542.

[5]John is a prophetic figure in Mark, as is shown by

prophets (8:28). Jesus then asks, "But you, who do you say I am?" (8:29). Peter answers: σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός (8:29). Peter's answer is in contrast to the opinions of men. The title goes beyond the realm of the prophetic. Jesus is not an eschatological figure; he is the eschatological figure. Peter is here giving the Christian confession; he is not confessing Jesus as the Jewish Messiah. To try to understand Peter's confession in terms of Jewish messianism involves an historicizing exegesis of the passage.[1] There are two clear indications that we are dealing with the Christian title "Christ" and not the Jewish "Messiah." The form of Peter's statement is one indication. This σὺ εἶ sentence is in solemn predication style;[2] this leaves no doubt that we are dealing with a confessional statement.[3] A further indication is the command to silence in v. 30. We have seen that this command is redactional and is part of the messianic secret.[4] Like the commands to the demons, the command here indicates that what Peter has said is correct. The command implies that the confession is correct. Therefore the confession cannot mean that Jesus is the Jewish Messiah but must mean that he is the Christian

---

11:32 and the equation of John with Elijah in 1:2-8 and 9:11-13.

[1]Jan Lambrecht, "The Christology of Mark," Biblical Theology Bulletin 3 (1973): 256-59.

[2]Eduard Norden, Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede (Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1913), p. 185.

[3]Horstmann, p. 16. [4]See above, p. 50.

Christ. Peter is giving the confession of Mark's community.[1]

Horstmann believes that the title "Christ" has lost its meaning for Mark's community. It has become vague and meaningless and is no longer able to carry the Christian content of the death and resurrection.[2] Weeden and Perrin contend that Mark uses the Son of Man saying in v. 31 to correct a false understanding of Peter's confession.[3] For these authors the Son of Man saying either fills the confession in 8:29 with meaning of corrects it. However, we will see that the tendency of Mark is to coordinate the three main titles that he uses for Jesus. He does not correct one with the other. In the present case we must allow for the possibility that the Christ confession has the same content as the Son of Man saying.

The question remains whether Peter's confession is redactional or whether Mark is using a narrative from the tradition. The answer is to be found in an analysis of the entire section 8:27-29 which cannot be undertaken at this point. However, we have already found extensive Markan redactional activity in the part of the Caesarea Philippi pericope that has been examined. Mark has added the command to silence in v. 30. He is responsible for the framing of the Son of Man

---

[1]Haenchen, "Komposition," p. 87.

[2]Horstmann, pp. 18-20, 28.

[3]Theodore J. Weeden, "The Heresy That Necessitated Mark's Gospel," ZNW 59 (1968): 147-50, 155-56; idem, Mark--Traditions in Conflict (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), pp. 52-69; Perrin, Redaction Criticism, pp. 53-56; idem, "The Christology of Mark," L'évangile selon Marc: Tradition et rédaction, Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium, vol. 34, ed. M. Sabbe (Louvain: Leuven University, 1974), pp. 476-77.

saying in vv. 31a and 32a, and for the dialogue of Jesus and Peter in vv. 32b-33.[1] We will return to this point in Chapter V.

In a collection of sayings and short dialogues in 9:33-50, Jesus promises the disciples, "Whoever gives you a cup of water in the name that you are Christ's, amen I say to you he will not lose his reward" (9:41).[2] The saying is attached to the dialogue of the exorcist who is not a disciple by the link phrase ἐν ὀνόματι.[3] The phrase ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε is probably a Markan addition. It breaks the pattern of the link phrases;[4] and it makes the resulting expression overloaded. The genitive is a genitive of belonging. It expresses the closeness of the believer and Christ.[5] The closest parallels are the Pauline phrases οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (1 Cor 15:23), ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ (1 Cor 3:23), and ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ (Gal 3:29). That Mark introduced the title here is another indication that he did not consider it erroneous.[6]

The Son of David

As Jesus is leaving Jericho the blind Bartimaeus cries

---

[1] See above, pp. 50-55.

[2] The reading ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι disturbed many copiests, perhaps because it deviated from the pattern of 9:37, 38, 39. However, it should be read with $\aleph^{c}$ A B C* K L Π* al.

[3] Rudolf Schnackenburg, "Mk 9,33-50," Synoptische Studien, (Munich: Karl Zink, 1953), pp. 186-87.

[4] Compare ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου (9:37); ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου (9:39).

[5] Kramer, pp. 136-37. [6] Minette de Tillesse, p. 331.

out, "Son of David, Jesus, have pity on me" (10:47). The crowd orders him to be silent, but he cries out all the more, "Son of David, have pity on me" (10:48). We have seen that the crowd's efforts to silence Bartimaeus and his failure to obey are paralleled in the other commands to silence in Mark's gospel and are redactional.[1] This means that the second cry, "Son of David, have pity on me" (10:48), is from Mark. This is an indication that the title "Son of David" has importance for him and makes it probable that he introduced the title in v. 47 also.[2] This is confirmed by the fact that in v. 51 Bartimaeus addresses Jesus by the title "Rabbouni." Originally the story did not speak of the "Son of David," but this was introduced by Mark. A further confirmation comes from the pericope of the approach to Jerusalem. There the people cry out, "Blessed is the coming kingdom of our father David" (11:10). This indirect statement is only intelligible in the light of the explicit identification of Jesus as the "Son of David" in 10:47, 48. Mark has introduced the title "Son of David" into the Bartimaeus story to prepare for the approach to Jerusalem and the Son of David question in 12:35-37.

As Jesus approaches Jerusalem the people cry out:

> "Hosanna,
> Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord,
> Blessed is the coming kingdom of our father David,
> Hosanna in the highest." (11:9-10)

---

[1]See above, p. 65.

[2]Christoph Burger, pp. 61-62; Vernon K. Robbins, "The Healing of Blind Bartimaeus (10:46-52) in the Marcan Theology," JBL 92 (1973): 235-36.

"Hosanna" is the Greek transcription of the Hebrew cry "Save us" from Ps 118:25.[1] Here the Greek author understood it simply as a joyous cry as the addition "in the highest" at the end of the acclamation shows.[2] The first strophe of the acclamation comes from Ps 118:26 LXX. It could apply to any pilgrim coming to Jerusalem. The messianic overtones of the acclamation come from the second strophe. This strophe is decidedly un-Jewish. The kingdom of David does not come in Jewish expectations. The kingdom of God would come; the Messiah would come; but the most that could be said of the kingdom of David is that it would come again or be reestablished.[3] Furthermore, David is never referred to as "our father" in the Jewish tradition.[4] The second strophe clearly is modelled on the first strophe. It is a Christian literary formulation that comments on the first strophe. Who is responsible for the commentary? Jesus is not addressed as the Son of David.[5] Only the oblique reference to the kingdom of David gives the scene its hazy messianic light. This is in keeping with the messianic secret and points to Mark

---

[1]Eduard Lohse, "Hosianna," NT 6 (1963): 113-14; idem, "ὡσαννά," TDNT, vol. 9, ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1974), p. 682.

[2]Christoph Burger, p. 50. [3]Ibid.

[4]Lohmeyer, p. 231.

[5]A comparison with the other two synoptic gospels and with John is instructive. Matthew, Luke, and John lack the difficult second strophe found in Mark; and all three have a more explicit messianic reference. Compare Matt 21:9; Luke 19:38; John 12:13.

as the author. The verse is not really intelligible unless we know that Jesus is the Son of David. As we have seen, it is Mark who is careful to introduce this information in 10:47, 48.

After controversies with the Pharisees and Herodians (12:13-17) and with the Sadducees (12:18-27) and a discussion with a scribe (12:28-34), Jesus himself asks a question, "How do the scribes say that the Christ is the Son of David?" (12:35). Jesus then quotes Ps 110:1 LXX in which the author says, "The Lord said to my Lord, sit at my right hand until I put your enemies under your feet" (12:36).[1] Jesus then ends with the question, "David himself calls him lord, how is he his son?" (12:37). There are two main interpretations of this question. The first claims that the rhetorical question demands a negative answer. If the Christ is David's lord, he cannot be his son.[2] The second interpretation gives a positive answer to the rhetorical question and adds an important qualification. The Christ is David's son, but he is at the same time much more.[3]

---

[1]Mark differs from the Septuagint in two places. He does not have the article before κύριος, and he has ὑποκάτω instead of the Septuagint's ὑποπόδιον. (Many manuscripts read ὑποπόδιον in Mark, but this is obvious assimilation to the Septuagint). The substitution of ὑποκάτω may reflect Ps 8:7 LXX. See David M. Hay, Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity, Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, vol. 18 (Nashville and New York: Abingdon, 1973), p. 35.

[2]Christoph Burger, pp. 56-58.

[3]Lambrecht, Redaktion, p. 52; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Son of David Tradition and Mt 22:41-46 and Parallels," Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971), pp. 122-26; David M. Hay, p. 114.

The Psalm verse does not deny the Davidic sonship of the Christ; it shows rather that the dignity of the Christ transcends the limits of Davidic sonship. This second interpretation is the sense in which Mark understood this pericope which in all probability came to him from the tradition. For Mark Jesus is the Son of David. This is clear from 10:47, 48; and 11:10. Here we see how Mark understood the title. "Son of David" is a messianic title equivalent to "Christ." This is evident from the question in v. 35. At the same time Jesus as Son of David and Christ transcends all expectations of the Messiah. He is exalted to God's right hand. The Christian understanding of the Christ contains two poles: humiliation and exaltation. The humiliation pole embraces the passion and crucifixion. The exaltation pole includes the resurrection and glorification. Psalm 110 expresses the exaltation of the Christ to God's right hand.[1]

This exaltation pole of the title Christ is touched on indirectly in the eschatological discourse. In 13:6 Jesus prophesies that "many will come in my name, saying I am he." The phrases ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου and λέγοντες ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι interpret each other. The "many" give themselves out to be the returning Christ. This is confirmed by v. 21 where the disciples are warned not to believe one who says, "See, here is the Christ, see, there." In the context of the discourse this can only mean that the Son of Man whose coming in glory is expected, is none other than the returning Christ who is

---

[1]David M. Hay, p. 113.

identical with Jesus.[1] Again we have the coordination of the titles "Christ" and "Son of Man," not the correction of one by the other.

Mark uses the title "Son of David" only in the Jerusalem section. By his redaction of the Bartimaeus story and the pericope of the approach to Jerusalem he has brought Jesus into Jerusalem as the Son of David. In 12:35-37 he has linked the title to the title "Christ" and hinted that Jesus transcends all messianic expectations.

Christ in the Trial

At Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin (14:55-65) the proceedings are inconclusive until the high priest asks Jesus, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed One?" (14:61). Jesus answers, "I am, and you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Power and coming with the clouds of heaven" (14:62). The high priest responds by tearing his clothing, and the whole Sanhedrin condemns Jesus to death on the charge of blasphemy. In vv. 61-62 we have the three titles that are important for Mark: Christ, Son of God (here with the circumlocution "Blessed One"), and Son of Man. This passage is obviously extremely important for Mark and an attempt must be made to uncover his redaction. We are helped by the similarity of the Sanhedrin trial and the hearing before Pilate (15:2-5). Jesus is questioned twice by the high priest and twice by Pilate. The questions are similar and Jesus'

---

[1]Lambrecht, Redaktion, pp. 100, 103, 105.

reaction is similar on both occasions. The most striking difference between the two scenes is that the order of the two questions is reversed. A synoptic comparison of the two scenes reveals the strong similarities.[1]

14:60 καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς μέσον ἐπηρώτησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν λέγων, οὐκ ἀποκρίνῃ οὐδέν; τί οὗτοί σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν;	15:4 ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος πάλιν ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν λέγων, οὐκ ἀποκρίνῃ οὐδέν; ἴδε πόσα σου κατηγοροῦσιν.
61 ὁ δὲ ἐσιώπα καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδέν. πάλιν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ;	5 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκέτι οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη... 2 καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Πιλᾶτος σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων;
62 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἐγώ εἰμι...	ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ λέγει σὺ λέγεις.

The parallelism of the two accounts is so strong that there must be some literary connection between the two. Either one was modelled on the other,[2] or both were formulated by the same author.[3] What is of particular interest in the present context is that the second question of the high priest corresponds to Pilate's question, "Are you the king of the Jews?" (15:2). "The king of the Jews" is the Messiah-title looked at from outside, through non-Jewish eyes.[4] The central

---

[1]Emil Wendling, Die Entstehung des Marcus-Evangeliums: Philologische Untersuchungen (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1908), p. 178; Georg Braumann, "Markus 15,2-5 und Markus 14,55-64," ZNW 52 (1961): 273-78.

[2]Braumann, p. 278; Joachim Gnilka, "Die Verhandlungen vor dem Synhedrion und vor Pilatus nach Markus 14,53-15,5," Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Vorarbeiten, vol. 2 (Zürich, Einsiedeln, Cologne: Benziger, 1970), p. 12.

[3]Schenke, Der gekreuzigte Christus, pp. 58-60.

[4]Hermann Kleinknecht, et al., "βασιλεύς, κτλ.," TDNT, vol. 1, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley

issue of the Pilate hearing is Jesus' messiahship. It is probable that the high priest's question was originally fully parallel to Pilate's question and simply asked σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός; the phrase "the Son of the Blessed One" and the Son of Man saying were later additions. Even in the present text with the additions the central issue of the Sanhedrin trial is also Jesus' messiahship. The phrase "the Son of the Blessed One"[1] is in apposition to "the Christ." It may be that it further defines "Christ," but it does not contradict it. The question is still about Jesus' messiahship. To this question Jesus gives a clear affirmative answer. Jesus accepts the title "Christ." The Son of Man saying does not alter the confession. It is a prophecy containing a promise of Jesus' vindication and a threat against those who judge Jesus.[2] The high priest's tearing of his clothes and the condemnation of Jesus on the charge of blasphemy are responses to Jesus' affirmative answer to the messiahship question and not to the Son of Man saying.[3] This is borne out by the whole subsequent course of events of the passion. Jesus' hearing before Pilate centers on the

---

(Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964), pp. 577-78; Gerhard von Rad, Karl Georg Kuhn, Walter Gutbrod, "Ἰσραήλ, κτλ.," TDNT, vol. 3, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1965), pp. 375-77.

[1]"The Son of the Blessed One" is a circumlocution for the title "the Son of God." It will be discussed in Chapter III.

[2]Donald Juel, Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark, Society of Biblcal Literature Dissertation Series, vol. 31 (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977), p. 93.

[3]Ibid., pp. 98-106.

messiahship question (15:2). The title "the king of the Jews" is central in the Barabbas episode (15:6-15). Jesus is mocked (15:18) and crucified (15:26) as king of the Jews, and he is ridiculed at the foot of the cross as "the Christ, the king of Israel" (15:32). As is well known, it was not considered blasphemy to claim to be the Jewish Messiah.[1] In the Mishnah blasphemy meant the pronunciation of the sacred name.[2] Mark's concept is broader. It is brought out clearly in the story of the cure of the paralytic where the scribes respond to Jesus' forgiving of the paralytic's sins with the charge, "he blasphemes; who can forgive sins but God alone?" (2:7). Jesus' forgiving of sins is interpreted as a usurpation of a prerogative of God. Jesus' affirmative answer to the question whether he is the Christ is thus interpreted as an infringement on God's dignity. Since Jewish messianism in no way implies an infringement on God's dignity, it must be ruled out here. Jesus is claiming to be the Christian Christ.[3] The Christian confession of Jesus as the Christ is the cause of the condemnation. This is blasphemy in Jewish eyes.

The high priest's question announces one of the two major themes of the passion, the theme of the crucified Christ. The theme is taken up in the Pilate hearing and continued in the Barabbas episode and the mocking of the soldiers. The

---

[1]Eduard Lohse, History of the Suffering and Death of Jesus Christ, trans. Martin O. Dietrich (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967), p. 86.

[2]Sanhedrin 7:5. [3]Juel, p. 106.

inscription of the charge against Jesus restates the theme (15:26); it stands as a title for the whole crucifixion scene. The second major theme of the passion, the theme of the suffering just one, is expressed mainly in the quotations and allusions to the Psalms. In particular, Psalm 22 exercised a great influence on the portrayal of Jesus' crucifixion. Ps 22:1 is quoted in 15:34; and there are allusions to the psalm in 15:24 (compare Ps 22:18) and 15:29 (compare Ps 22:7). The suffering of the crucified Christ is portrayed in terms of the suffering of the just one of the Old Testament who in his suffering relies on God.[1]

The interpretation of the title "Christ" in Mark should begin with the high priest's question and Jesus' answer. Jesus' affirmative answer to the question makes it possible for us to understand better Peter's confession in 8:29. Peter's confession is the high priest's question (without the addition "the Son of the Blessed One") put in confessional form. It has been formulated with the high priest's question in mind. The two passages clearly correspond to each other. Jesus is condemned to death for affirming the confession Peter made but did not understand. This is the Christian confession that Jesus is the Christ. In other words, Jesus is put to death in Mark's gospel for being a Christian! He is put to death for making the confession that the members of Mark's

---

[1]Lothar Ruppert, Jesus als der leidende Gerechte?: Der Weg Jesu im Lichte alt- und zwischentestamentlichen Motivs, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, vol. 59 (Stuttgart: KBW, 1972), pp. 44-59; Schenke, Der gekreuzigte Christus, pp. 137-43.

community were called upon to make often at the risk of their own lives (13:9-13).

Light is also shed on the use of Christ in 9:41. The context of the saying, especially v. 40, presents a picture of the community's severe pressure from outside.[1] Against the backdrop of persecution, the Christian is promised that anyone who comes to his aid even in the least way will be rewarded. The members of the community are described as being "Christ's." They have made the confession that Peter made, and they are suffering for it just as Christ himself suffered for the same confession.

Finally, light is shed back on the use of Christ in 1:1. Mark's work is titled, "Beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ." Mark's account leads up to the passion and Jesus' death as the Christ. This death is the heart of the gospel's proclamation.

It is now clear why Mark has redacted the Son of David tradition as he did. In the tradition he had the pericope of the Son of David question. His gospel is moving toward the climax of the passion in which Jesus is crucified as the Christ. Mark introduced the title "Son of David" into the Bartimaeus episode and formulated 11:10 to bring Jesus into the city of Jerusalem as the Son of David, the Christ. In this way he prepares for the theme of the crucified Christ.

It is now possible to reexamine the positions of Horstmann, Weeden, and Perrin about the title "Christ" in

---

[1]Reploh, p. 150.

Mark.[1] Horstmann claims that the title has lost its effectiveness. It is no longer able to carry the kerygmatic message of the passion, death, and resurrection.[2] For Weeden, Christ is the title preferred by Mark's adversaries. It represents a glorious θεῖος ἀνήρ figure that Mark counters with his suffering Son of Man Christology.[3] Perrin also claims that Christ is the title of Mark's community which needs to be corrected by the Son of Man Christology.[4] From 14:61-62 we can see that these views do not do justice to Mark's understanding of the title "Christ." Jesus clearly accepts the Christ predicate in 14:62. The title is fully affirmed by Mark. If it were not important for Mark, it would not appear in the title of his work (1:1), and he would not have introduced it in 9:41. In 14:61-62 the title announces the theme of the crucified Christ which dominates the passion. Mark anticipates this theme by having Peter confess Jesus as the Christ in 8:29. Mark puts the confession in formal predication style and highlights its correctness by adding the command to silence. Of course Peter does not understand the confession, but this is fully in keeping with the messianic secret and the theme of the lack of understanding of the disciples. The title "Christ" is not the title of Mark's opponents. It is

---

[1]See above, p. 88.

[2]Horstmann, pp. 18-20, 28.

[3]Weeden, "Heresy," pp. 147-50, 155-56; idem, Traditions, pp. 52-69.

[4]Perrin, Redaction Criticism, pp. 53-56; idem, "Christology," pp. 476-77.

a title that Mark affirms.

The King of the Jews

In the trial before the Sanhedrin Mark has announced the theme that Jesus is crucified as the Christ. This theme is developed in the following narrative of the passion.

The pericope of the hearing before Pilate does not flow smoothly. Verse 2 does not appear to be in its proper place. The question of Pilate comes too early.[1] It is not motivated. How did he come to ask Jesus whether he is the king of the Jews? In the present text there is a multiple change of subject that is awkward.[2] In the trial before the Sanhedrin the question of messiahship came at the end of the proceedings. The strong parallelism of the Pilate hearing and the trial before the Sanhedrin indicates that there has been some dislocation here. Originally v. 2 followed on v. 5. This would give a more logical sequence. The reason for the dislocation was to allow for the introduction of the Barabbas episode which has suppressed the verdict of guilty in the Pilate hearing. The reason for the suppression of the verdict is that for the narrator the condemnation of Jesus must come from the Jewish authorities. It is they who force Pilate to execute Jesus. It is easier for the Barabbas episode to be attached to v. 5 than to v. 2. The expression of wonder can

---

[1]Wolfgang Schenk, Der Passionsbericht nach Markus: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Passionstradition (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1974), p. 244.

[2]Schenke, Der gekreuzigte Christus, pp. 52-53.

be taken as an indication that Pilate does not think that Jesus is guilty and the Barabbas episode bears this out.[1] The dislocation has placed the title "the king of the Jews" emphatically at the beginning of the narrative where it announces the theme. From the very beginning the decisive title is spoken.[2] The title is the same as the charge in the Sanhedrin scene. The high priest asks if Jesus is the Christ; Pilate asks the same question in the terminology of an outsider.

Heavy irony characterizes the further use of the title "the king of the Jews" in the passion narrative. The people, driven by the murderous envy of the high priests, prefer a murderer to their king (15:6-15).[3] Jesus is rejected by the people as king just as he was rejected by the Jewish leaders. In 15:16-20 Jesus is mocked as king of the Jews. The purple robe, the crown of thorns, the greeting "Hail, king of the Jews," and the homage all mock Jesus as king. On the deeper level of faith, the title is true; it expresses Jesus' true dignity. The irony of its use in the passion captures the paradox of Jesus' messiahship. He is king, but he is a suffering king whose throne is the cross. The inscription of the charge against Jesus stands as a title to the crucifixion scene (15:26). What appears to the Jews and the gentiles as ridicule is for the Christian community the truth. The reality of the cross prevents the title from being

---

[1]Ibid., p. 54. [2]Schweizer, Mark, p. 335.

[3]Schenke, Der gekreuzigte Christus, pp. 47-48.

misunderstood.[1]

The complex mocking scene (15:29-32) with its three groups of mockers shows signs of reworking and secondary additions. Verse 29a with the mention of the chance passersby is probably traditional. The taunt in vv. 29b-30, however, is probably redactional. It looks back on the temple saying in 14:58 which is a Markan insertion into the trial.[2] Also v. 30 does not follow smoothly on v. 29b as it is not clear why the temple saying would lead to Jesus' saving himself. A more natural sequence is found in vv. 31b-32a in which Jesus' saving of others is made the basis for a taunt for him to save himself. Although Mark is probably responsible for v. 31a with its mention of the chief enemies of Jesus and the joining of two groups with μετά,[3] the taunt in vv. 31b-32a is the traditional taunt. Verse 30 is modelled on it, picking up the phrases "saving oneself" and "coming down from the cross." Verse 32b referring back to v. 27 would have closed the traditional scene.[4] In the taunt in vv. 31b-32a the two titles "Christ" and "king of the Jews" are joined together. The second title is changed to "king of Israel" to make it fit more naturally the Jewish speakers.[5] The linking of the two titles here confirms the impression created by the parallelism of the Sanhedrin trial and the Pilate hearing that the two

---

[1]Ibid., p. 105. [2]Gnilka, "Verhandlungen," pp. 19-20.

[3]Compare 1:29; 3:6; 15:1.

[4]Schenke, Der gekreuzigte Christus, pp. 92-94.

[5]Grundmann, et al., p. 528.

titles are equivalent. Like the title on the cross the ridicule of Jesus speaks the truth for the community. Against all appearance the community believes that Jesus is the Christ, the king of Israel. The whole paradox of a crucified Christ is compressed into a short formula. The powerless crucified one is the Christ who is the salvation of others. What is formulated as a mocking saying is affirmed by the Christian community. The firm ground of religious experience is abandoned for the paradoxical will of God.[1]

Conclusions

Mark uses "Christ" twice as a name (1:1; 9:41) and four times as a title for Jesus (8:29; 12:35; 14:61; 15:32). In the two uses as a name the confessional title is not lost sight of but is in the immediate background. The four titular uses are significant. Two (8:29; 14:61) are major confessional statements, and two (12:35; 15:32) are link passages that connect the title to Lord and Son of David (12:35) and to king of the Jews (15:32). The two link passages are also interpretative, drawing out the exaltation (12:35) and humiliation (15:32) poles of the title. Mark's usage falls within the framework of Christian messianism. This is shown by the absolute usage (8:29; 12:35; 14:61; 15:32) which is not common in pre-Christian Judaism and by the close parallels to Pauline usage (1:1; 9:41).

Except for the title of Mark's work (1:1), the title "Christ" is not found in the first half of the gospel. This

---

[1]Schenke, Der gekreuzigte Christus, pp. 105-106.

is in keeping with the messianic secret. In the second half of the gospel up to the trial before the Sanhedrin, it is confined to instructions to the disciples except for the general discussion about the Son of David in which, however, there is no explicit identification of Jesus with the Christ. The messianic secret is disclosed at the trial before the Sanhedrin and before Pilate, and subsequently Jesus' enemies use the title in the taunt under the cross.

In Christian messianism the title "Christ" is associated with the passion, death, and resurrection. Mark is in this tradition. In particular, the pre-Markan passion narrative had as one of its major themes the theme of the crucified Christ. The high priest's question in its original form, "Are you the Christ?," stands as a title over the whole passion. Jesus is condemned for affirming the title. The use of the title in the passion determines the meaning of Peter's confession. Peter's confession is the question of the high priest put in confessional form. But whereas Jesus knowingly affirmed the title at the trial and unleashed the passion, Peter does not understand the confession he has made. The paradox of the crucified Christ is beyond him. He does not know who Jesus is.

In the present form of the trial pericope, the high priest's question has been expanded with the addition of "the Son of the Blessed One." The title "Son of God" is thus placed in apposition to the title "Christ." We now turn to explore the meaning of "Son of God" in Mark.

CHAPTER III

SON OF GOD

The title "Son of God" appears only indirectly in the Caesarea Philippi episode (8:38). However, it is the center of the immediately following pericope, the Transfiguration, and it appears in apposition to the title "Christ" in the high priest's question. To understand Peter's confession we must try to understand the meaning of "Son of God" in Mark.

"Son of God" is used as a designation for Jesus in 3:11 and 15:39. The voice at the baptism (1:11) and the Transfiguration (9:7) calls Jesus "my only Son," and there is a further reference to an only son in the parable of the wicked tenants (12:6). In the pericope of the Gerasene demoniac Jesus is addressed as "Son of the most high God" (5:7). In the eschatological discourse Jesus talks of "the Son" (13:32). At the trial the high priest asks whether Jesus is "the Son of the Blessed One" (14:61). Jesus accepts the title in 14:62. Jesus' prayer in Gethsemane with the address "Abba, Father" (14:36) is also important for understanding Son of God in Mark.

First we will consider the Jewish background of the title. Then we will follow the order of Mark's gospel, treating the baptism, the demon's cries, the Transfiguration, the

parable of the wicked tenants, the eschatological discourse, Gethsemane, the trial, and the centurion's confession.

Jewish Background

In the Old Testament there are several references to divine beings called "the sons of God" (Gen 6:2, 4; Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; Dan 3:25; Ps 29:1; 82:6; 89:7). Gen 6:1-4 contains a fragment of a myth in which the sons of God have intercourse with the daughters of men and give birth to the race of the giants. The sons of God were originally gods, but the Israelite narrator did not consider them sons in the physical sense but thought of them as subordinate to Yahweh.[1] The term indicates participation in the divine realm. The same ideas are found in Ps 29. The "sons of God" praise and worship God on his throne and cry glory in his temple (Ps 29:1-2, 9). The psalm is a Canaanite hymn adapted by Israel to the worship of Yahweh. The original polytheistic pantheon is reduced to God's court. In Ps 89:6-8 the "sons of God" form a divine assembly around Yahweh. Yahweh is praised "in the assembly of the holy ones" (v. 6). His superiority is proclaimed: "who can be compared to the Lord among the sons of God?" (v. 7). Yahweh is to be feared "in the council of the holy ones" (v. 8). The "sons of God" are clearly subordinated to Yahweh who rules over them. In Ps 82 Yahweh takes his stand in the divine assembly and judges the sons of God for judging unjustly. They are stripped of their

---

[1]Gerald Cooke, "The Sons of (the) God(s)," ZAW 76 (1964): 24.

immortality for their failure. In Job 1:6-12; 2:1-6 the "sons of God" are completely subordinated to Yahweh. They are his ministers and stand ready to do his bidding. In Job 38:7 the "sons of God" are parallel to the stars and may reflect the original concept of the pantheon. In Dan 3:25 the "son of God" (here only in the singular) is an angel.[1] The development of the concept is not hard to follow. Originally the "sons of God" were gods, members of the divine pantheon gathered around the chief god. In Israel the concept was modified and transformed by faith in Yahweh. The "sons of God" were stripped of their independent power and more and more subordinated to Yahweh. They became his court, his advisors, his ministers, his agents. Finally the term means no more than belonging to the divine realm.[2] This Old Testament usage of the term "sons of God" is frequently discounted as a possible background for the term "son of God" in the gospels.[3]

In the Old Testament Israel is also called God's son. The terminology is rooted in the Exodus experience. In Exod 4:22-23 Yahweh tells Moses:

---

[1]Cooke, "The Sons of (the) God(s)," pp. 24-47; Peter Wülfing von Martitz, et al, "υἱός, κτλ.," TDNT, vol. 8, ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1972), pp. 347-49.

[2]Wülfing von Martitz, et al., pp. 348-49.

[3]Erminie Huntress, "'Son of God' in Jewish Writings Prior to the Christian Era," JBL 54 (1935): 117; A.-L. Descamps, "Pour une histoire du titre 'Fils de Dieu': Les antécédents par rapport à Marc," L'évangile selon Marc: Tradition et rédaction, Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium, vol. 34, ed. M. Sabbe (Louvain: Leuven University, 1974), p. 532.

> And you shall say to Pharaoh: "Thus says Yahweh: 'Israel is my son, my first-born. And I have said to you, dismiss my son, that he may serve me; and you have refused to dismiss him. Behold I will kill your son, your first-born.'"

The father-son terminology denotes two aspects of Israel's relationship to Yahweh. It expresses the love of Yahweh for Israel. It can also express the subjection of Israel to Yahweh and the obligation of the son to obey.[1] Israel frequently did not live up to the obligation of obedience and this gives rise to the lament of Yahweh:[2]

> A son pays honor to his father and a servant to his lord;
> If I am a father, where is my honor? If I am a lord,
> where is my reverence? (Mal 1:6)

Yahweh's love, though, overrides the disobedience of the son:

> Is not Ephraim a dear son to me,
> Yes, a child of delight?
> For as often as I meditate (threats) against him,
> I still cherish his memory.
> Therefore my pity is moved towards him,
> I will have great compassion on him. (Jer 31:20)

In all of these passages it is the community of Israel who is God's son.[3] In late Judaism there is the development of the idea that the individual is a son of Yahweh. In Sir 51:10 (Hebrew) the individual says to Yahweh, "You are my father." In Sir 4:10 (Hebrew) the promise is given to the one who cares for the widow and the orphan, "Then God will call you son and be gracious to you and save you from the pit."[4]

The king is called God's son in three places in the

---

[1] Wülfing von Martitz, et al., p. 352.

[2] Compare also Hos 11:1-9; Isa 1:2-3; Deut 32:6.

[3] Compare also Isa 45:11; 63:15-16.

[4] Wülfing von Martitz, et al., pp. 354-55, 360.

Old Testament. In 2 Sam 7:14 God says of David's descendent, "I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me." The language is metaphorical.[1] The root of the idea is the common Near Eastern belief that the king is in some sense the son of the god.[2] In Israel there could be no idea of the king being the physical son of God. The oracle further promises that God's kindness will not leave David's descendents. The reign of David's house will last forever (vv. 13, 16). Already we have the note of everlasting rule. In Ps 89:27-28 David's successor appeals to the covenant of sonship in his plea to God. The king reminds God of his oracle:

> "He shall call unto me, 'You are my father,
> My God, and the rock of my deliverence.'
> And I will make him the first-born,
> The highest of the kings of the earth."

The fact that the king is God's son is the basis for his appeal for help. Yahweh will establish him as the first of the kings of the earth. Not only is the king's rule forever; it is also universal. Psalm 2 appeals to the coronation of the king as God's son:

> I will tell of the decree of the Lord;
> He said to me, "You are my son, today I have begotten you."
> (Ps 2:7)

The enthronement is understood as creation and birth by God.[3]

---

[1]Gerald Cooke, "The Israelite King as Son of God," ZAW 73 (1961): 207.

[2]See, for example, Ivan Engnell, Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967).

[3]Martin Hengel, The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), p. 23.

The belief that the king is God's son was easily assimilated to the sonship of Israel.[1] The king was the representative of the people, the epitome of the people. Just as the father-son image was used to express Israel's special relation to Yahweh flowing from Yahweh's election of Israel and the covenant, so the election and the covenant of the king was expressed in the father-son image. The king's prerogatives rest on the choice of Yahweh and the king's duty of obedience flows from his sonship.

There is no clear use of "son of God" as a title for the Messiah in the pre-Christian period. The references in the apocryphal writings have been shown to be either later insertions or mistranslations from a Semitic original. The reference in 1 Enoch 105:2 is a later addition. It is not found in the Greek fragment of 1 Enoch. The passages in 4 Ezra (7:28; 13:32, 37, 52; 14:9) probably go back to an original "my servant."[2] A slightly different picture emerges when we turn to Qumran. In 4QFlor Nathan's prophecy in 2 Sam 7:10-14 is quoted, concluding with the words, "I [will be] to him a father, and he shall be to me a son." The exposition adds, "He is the Branch of David who shall arise with the Interpreter of the Law [to rule] in Zion [at the end] of time." The text 2 Sam 7:14 is clearly referred

---

[1]Cooke, "Israelite King," pp. 217-18.

[2]Evald Lövestam, Son and Saviour: A Study of Acts 13,32-37 (Lund: G. W. K. Gleerup, 1961), p. 88; Hahn, p. 282, Wülfing von Martitz, et al., p. 361.

to the Messiah.[1] The fragment then goes on to quote the beginning of Ps 2, but the text breaks off. In 1QSa 2:11-12 there is a possible reference to Ps 2:7 in the phrase "when (God) brings it about that the Messiah is born among them."[2] In neither text do we have "Son of God" used as a title for the Messiah. The title "Son of God" does appear in a fragmentary text 4QpsDan A^a that is restored and translated by Fitzmyer:[3]

> [But your son] 7 shall be great upon the earth, 8 [O King! All (men) shall] make [peace], and all shall serve 9 [him. He shall be called the son of] the [G]reat [God], and by his name shall he be named. (Col. II) 1 He shall be hailed (as) the Son of God, and they shall call him Son of the Most High. As comets (flash) 2 to the sight, so shall be their kingdom. (For some) year[s] they shall rule upon 3 the earth and shall trample everything (under foot); people shall trample upon people, city upon ci[t]y, 4 (vacat) until there arises the people of God, and everyone rests from the sword.

The title "Son of God" is not used to refer to someone who is called the Messiah. The text is apocalyptic according to Fitzmyer, and the title probably refers to an enthroned king. Fitzmyer also points out several parallels between the text and the infancy narrative of Luke.[4] The fact that the title

---

[1]Allegro, "References," pp. 176-77; idem, "Fragments," pp. 350-54; Lövestam, p. 89; Hahn, p. 282.

[2]Otto Michel and Otto Betz, "Von Gott gezeugt," Judentum--Urchristentum--Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, vol. 26, ed. Walther Eltester (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1960), pp. 11-12; Hahn, p. 283; Hengel, Son of God, p. 44.

[3]Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament," NTS 20 (1973-74): 393.

[4]Luke 1:32//4QpsDan A^a 1:7; 2:1; Luke 1:33//4QpsDan A^a 2:5; Luke 1:35//4QpsDan A^a 2:1, 5. Fitzmyer, "Contribution,"

is used in a royal context is significant. Perhaps we can say on the basis of the three Qumran texts that "Son of God" was on the verge of becoming a title for the Messiah in Judaism.

The background of the New Testament title "Son of God" is to be found in the Jewish material we have surveyed. Divine sonship is not an element of Hellenistic θεῖος ἀνήρ conceptions. This term is not a fixed expression in pre-Christian Hellenism, and divine sonship is not regularly associated with these figures.[1] The term υἱὸς θεοῦ is not used as a title in the Hellenistic world with the exception of an isolated use as a title for Augustus, but this could not possibly be the background for the New Testament title.[2]

The Baptism of Jesus

The first mention of Jesus' sonship in Mark is in the baptism. The reading υἱοῦ θεοῦ is widely attested in the title of the gospel (1:1).[3] It is further argued that its omission by some witness can be accounted for by homoioteleuton and that the title is important for Mark and is to be expected at the beginning of his work.[4] This last argument

---

p. 394.

[1]Wülfing von Martitz, et al., pp. 339-40.

[2]Hengel, Son of God, p. 30.

[3]Read by ℵ^{a} B D L W al; omitted by ℵ* θ 28 al.

[4]Taylor, p. 152; Schnackenburg, "Das Evangelium," pp. 321-22.

works both ways. The undoubted importance of the title for Mark may have been the reason why a later scribe added it here. There was a tendency among copiests to expand the titles of books.[1] It is more probable that the shorter reading is original, although it must be admitted that both sides have a strong case. The point will probably always be fought over.

After the baptism Jesus sees the heavens split open and the spirit like a dove descending on him.[2] It is possible that the earliest account of the baptism of Jesus mentioned only the descent of the spirit and did not include the voice from heaven. The motif of the splitting open of the heavens is not necessarily linked with the hearing of the divine voice. The opening of the heavens is always so that something can be seen or so that God can come down.[3] Here the heavens are opened so that the spirit can descend on Jesus. This may be an indication that Jesus is being introduced as the Messiah. In 1 Sam 16:13 David's anointing brings the spirit. The future king was expected to possess the spirit (Isa 11:2).[4]

---

[1]Metzger, p. 73.

[2]For the symbolism of the dove, see Ernst Haenchen, Der Weg Jesu: Eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1966), pp. 53-54; Leander E. Keck, "The Spirit and the Dove," NTS 17 (1970-71): 41-67; Georg Richter, "Zu den Tauferzählungen Mk 1,9-11 und Joh 1,32-34," ZNW 65 (1974): 43-45; Pesch, "Anfang," p. 127; Stephen Gero, "The Spirit as a Dove at the Baptism of Jesus," NT 18 (1976): 17-35.

[3]Ezek 1:1; Isa 63:19; 3 Mac 6:18; John 1:51; Acts 7:55-56; Rev 4:1. See Richter, pp. 48-49.

[4]Burkill, Revelation, p. 17.

In its present form the climax of the narrative is reached in the words of the voice from heaven:

σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπήτος
ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα. (1:11)

The words echo several Old Testament passages. When God speaks he quotes the Old Testament! The precise reference, though, is disputed. Three passages are usually cited as lying behind the words of the voice: Ps 2:7; Isa 42:1; and Gen 22:2. Of these the only one that is certain is Ps 2:7,[1] cited in a form that varies little from the Septuagint.[2] The main change is that the word order is different.[3] Mark has brought the subject before the copula. This conforms the quotation to formal predication style;[4] and it brings the quotation into line with the other σὺ εἶ statements in the gospel.[5] The change stresses that this you is God's son rather than the

---

[1]Jeremias denies the influence of Ps 2:7 and sees only a reference to Isa 42:1, arguing that υἱός μου has replaced an original παῖς μου. See W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, The Servant of God, Studies in Biblical Theology, vol. 20 (London: SCM, 1957), pp. 80-81. But there is no other example of this replacement. See A. Feuillet, "Le bapteme de Jésus," RB 71 (1964): 325. For a detailed critique of Jeremias see I. Howard Marshall, "Son of God or Servant of Yahweh?--A Reconsideration of Mark I,11," NTS 15 (1968-69): 326-32.

[2]LXX: υἱός μου εἶ σύ.

[3]The other change is secondary. The Septuagint does not have the article with υἱός. Because the predicate has been shifted the article became necessary. See E. C. Colwell, "A Definite Rule for the Use of the Article in the Greek New Testament," JBL 52 (1933): 12-21.

[4]Norden, p. 185.

[5]Statements: 3:11; 8:29 (compare questions: 14:61; 15:2).

choice of the one addressed to be God's son.[1] This emphasis on the σύ is further stressed in the second half of the verse with its initial ἐν σοί. This should be brought out in the translation: "You are my only Son; You I have chosen." The sense is: "You I have chosen to be my only Son." The predicate is not what is stressed. What is stressed is the choice of this Jesus to be God's only Son.[2] The meaning of the baptism pericope is to identify Jesus as the eschatological agent of God. He is the object of God's special election. The quotation of Ps 2:7 means that the primary background of the title "Son of God" is royal messianism.

Jesus' sonship is unique; he is God's only Son.[3] The expression "only son" occurs also in 9:7 and 12:6. The threefold occurrence cannot be accidental. Most probably one use is original and the other two borrowed. The voice in the Transfiguration is probably dependent on the voice in the baptism.[4] This narrows the choice to either the baptism or the parable of the wicked tenants as the original use. In the parable ἀγαπητός fits naturally. It is essential in

---

[1] I. Howard Marshall, "Son of God," pp. 332-33.

[2] Anton Vögtle, "Die sogenannte Taufperikope Mk 1,9-11: Zur Problematik der Herkunft und des ursprünglichen Sinns," Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Vorarbeiten, vol. 4 (Zurich, Einsiedeln, Cologne: Benziger, 1972), pp. 126, 135.

[3] Αγαπητός is an attributive adjective, not a title. See G. D. Kilpatrick, "The Order of some Noun and Adjective Phrases in the New Testament," NT 5 (1962): 111-14. For the translation "only" see C. H. Turner, "Ο ΥΙΟΣ ΜΟΥ Ο ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ," JTS 27 (1925-26): 113-29; A. Souter, "ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ," JTS 28 (1926-27): 59-60; C. H. Turner, "ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ," JTS 28 (1926-27): 362.

[4] Nützel, Verklärungserzählung, pp. 148-49, 151-52.

showing the great effort of the owner to claim his due.[1] Also the son must be an only son or his death will do the tenants no good.[2] Stylistically the omission of the phrase ὁ ἀγαπητός improves the parallelism of the two strophes of v. 11 by making them more equal in length. Thus ὁ ἀγαπητός is probably a Markan redactional addition to the words of the voice. The rest of v. 11 is probably traditional. The word ἀγαπητός probably contains an allusion to Gen 22:2, 12, 16 LXX.[3] Mark has added the word to hint at a parallel between Jesus' sonship and Isaac's. It is risky to build a case on one word. However, Rom 8:32 shows that there was early interest in Isaac typology in the Christian community.[4] There is already the shadow of the passion in the baptism. Jesus' sonship and his messiahship are linked with his death. Even if we discount the reference to Gen 22, there is a reference to Jesus' death in ἀγαπητός which flows from the parable of the wicked tenants.

It is frequently stated that Isa 42:1 lies behind the second part of the heavenly voice's proclamation. However, εὐδοκέω ἐν is not found in Isa 42:1 LXX. A closer parallel

---

[1]Josef Blank, "Die Sendung des Sohnes: Zur christologischen Bedeutung des Gleichnisses von den bösen Winzern Mk 12,1-12," Neues Testament und Kirche: Für Rudolf Schnackenburg, ed. Joachim Gnilka (Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1974), p. 39.

[2]D. E. Nineham, The Gospel of St. Mark, The Pelican Gospel Commentaries (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963), p. 312.

[3]It does not reflect the Targum. See Marshall, "Son of God," pp. 333-34.

[4]See further J. Edwin Wood, "Isaac Typology in the New Testament," JBL 14 (1967-68): 583-89.

is 2 Sam 22:20 LXX:

καὶ ἐξήγαγεν με εἰς πλατυσμὸν
καὶ ἐξείλατό με, ὅτι εὐδόκησεν ἐν ἐμοί.

There is a difficulty in that this passage is not quoted elsewhere in the New Testament,[1] but the close verbal similarity outweighs this consideration. When used of God in the New Testament εὐδοκέω expresses a specific act of God's will.[2] Here it expresses the election of Jesus. The notion of election is already contained in the title "Son."[3] It is emphasized explicitly in this second half of the verse. This passage from 2 Sam 22:20 LXX also comes from the royal tradition that grew up around David and his dynasty. The combination with Ps 2:7 thus makes it certain that the primary background for the title "Son of God" in the baptism is Jewish royal messianism.

In Mark, Jesus alone sees the heavens split open and the spirit descending; Jesus alone hears the voice from heaven. This is the first instance of the secrecy motif in Mark. Who Jesus is is a secret, and the crowds and even John are not allowed to hear the voice.[4]

---

[1]Marshall, "Son of God," p. 334.

[2]Luke I2:32; 1 Cor 1:21; Gal 1:15; Col 1:19. See B. W. Bacon, "Notes on New Testament Passages: I On the Aorist εὐδόκησα in Mark i.11 and Parallels," JBL 16 (1897): 136-39; idem, "Supplementary Note on the Aorist εὐδόκησα, Mark i.11," JBL 20 (1901): 28-30.

[3]See above, p. 111.

[4]For the reason for this secrecy in the pre-Markan pericope see Vögtle, "Taufperikope," pp. 134-35. Mark understood it as part of the messianic secret. Matthew and Luke do not share Mark's concern for secrecy. Matthew turns the

The baptism is a curtain raiser. The miraculous elements--the splitting of the heavens, the descent of the spirit, the voice--are all motifs from Jewish eschatology.[1] They are signs of the in-breaking of salvation.[2] Mark is depicting here the divine dimension in which the life and passion of Jesus will be enacted. In vv. 9-13 there are almost exclusively supernatural agents. It is heaven which here comes down to earth.[3]

The Demons' Cries

At the end of an extended summary Mark reports that whenever the unclean spirits saw Jesus they fell down and cried out, "You are the Son of God" (3:11). The words echo the heavenly voice at the baptism. The phrase "my only Son" is changed to "the Son of God" reflecting the change of speaker. The words also echo the cry in 5:7. This verse and the command to silence in v. 12 are redactional.[4] Mark is here introducing the title "Son of God" by his own hand.

---

words of the voice into a public proclamation (Matt 3:17). Luke makes the scene more objectively visible by adding that the spirit descended "in bodily form" (Luke 3:22).

[1]Philipp Vielhauer, "Erwägungen zur Christologie des Markusevangeliums," Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80.Geburtstag, ed. Erich Dinkler with Hartwig Thyen (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964), p. 161.

[2]Buse and Feuillet see especially the influence of Isa 63:19 on the baptism pericope. See Ivor Buse, "The Markan Account of the Baptism of Jesus and Isaiah LXIII," JTS 7 (1956): 74-75; André Feuillet, "Le bapteme de Jésus d'apres l'évangile selon Saint Marc (1,9-11)," CBQ 21 (1959): 468-90.

[3]Nineham, p. 58; Wülfing von Martitz, et al., p. 378.

[4]See above, pp. 17-19.

He emphasizes it by putting it in the mouths of the unclean spirits. They are supernatural agents and have supernatural power and insight. He underlines the correctness of the title with the command to silence.

When the Gerasene demoniac sees Jesus, he runs, throws himself down before him, and cries, "What have you to do with me, Jesus, Son of the most high God? I implore you by God not to torture me" (5:7). The first four words in Greek are a quotation from 1 Kgs 17:18 LXX. Except for a change in number the same quotation appears in 1:24. Both verses draw on a tradition in which the Old Testament passage was used to ward off the influence of a hostile force. The demons here use the saying to try to counter Jesus' power and render him helpless. The oath in the second part of the saying has the same purpose. In line with this Jesus is addressed with the most correct name possible.[1] The expression "most high God" is rare in early Christian literature. In the New Testament it is found only in the mouths of demons or in a quotation from the Old Testament.[2] It is a typically gentile way of referring to Israel's God.[3] Here it has a syncretistic nuance.[4] Again Mark adds a command to silence in 5:8.[5] Jesus' sonship falls under the messianic secret. It may not be proclaimed.

---

[1]Bauernfeind, pp. 16-17.

[2]Compare Acts 16:17; Heb 7:1.

[3]Compare Dan 3:26; 4:2. See Nineham, p. 153.

[4]Bauernfeind, p. 24. [5]See above, pp. 19-20.

The Transfiguration

The title "Son of God" appears only indirectly in the Caesarea Philippi pericope. In 8:38 Jesus tells of the coming of the Son of Man: "Whoever is ashamed of me and my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of Man will be ashamed of him when he comes in his Father's glory with the holy angels." Here we have another example of Mark coordinating the Christological titles he uses for Jesus.

The title "Son of God" does figure prominently in the Transfiguration narrative. The climax of the present text is reached in the voice from the cloud:

> οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός,
> ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ. (9:7)

The similarity of this scene and the baptism is striking. In both scenes the words are spoken by a voice from above, and in each case the first strophe is identical except that the direct address of the baptism has become a proclamation to the three disciples. The similarity is so strong that there must be literary dependence of one passage on the other.[1] Which of the two is original? The decision must rest on the second strophe. The key word in the second strophe of 1:11, εὐδοκέω, occurs only here in Mark's gospel. The key word in the second strophe of 9:7, ἀκούω, is used so frequently and in such significant contexts that we can speak of a well developed listening theme in Mark.[2] The conclusion forces itself

---

[1]Horstmann, p. 91; Nützel, Verklärungserzählung, p. 148.

[2]The theme is strongly emphasized in the parable chap-

upon us that the voice in 1:11 is traditional.[1] Mark has simply added ὁ ἀγαπητός in 1:11. The words of the voice in 9:7 are added by Mark. The first strophe is modelled on 1:11, and the second strophe expresses Mark's listening theme with an allusion to Deut 18:15.

What is Mark trying to do with his redaction of the Transfiguration pericope? He is not trying to describe the end-time but to reveal who Jesus is.[2] The details of the narrative portray Jesus as one from the heavenly realm. White is the color of heavenly clothing. It is the color of the clothing of angels (Mark 16:5; Matt 28:3; John 20:12; Acts 1:10) and of the blessed in heaven (Rev 6:11; 7:9, 13). Although only his clothes are described, there is a change in Jesus' person implied in the word μετεμορφώθη. The closest parallel to this transformation into a light figure is that which the blessed experience in the end-time. For example, in Dan 12:3 the righteous are described in terms of shining light:

> And those who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the firmament,
> And they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever.

---

ter. There is the repeated appeal to listen in 4:3, 9, 23, 24. It is emphasized in the Isaiah quotation in 4:12 and echoed in 4:33. Besides it appears four times in the explanation of the parable of the sower (4:15, 16, 18, 20). Outside the parable chapter it appears in 6:11; 7:14; 8:18; and here in 9:7. See Lambrecht, Marcus Interpretator, pp. 124-27.

[1]The original baptism tradition may not have included the voice, but it was added before Mark. See above, pp. 115-18.

[2]Nützel, Verklärungserzählung, p. 247.

Jesus is transformed as the just are to be transformed in the new age.[1] This experience is not for him but for the disciples.[2] They look upon him as someone other than the one they have known up to now.[3] The presence of Elijah and Moses and their conversing with Jesus also contribute to the portrayal of Jesus as one from the heavenly realm.[4] This also explains Peter's reply, "Rabbi, it is good for us to be here" (9:5a), and the desire to prolong the event (9:5b). The predicate "Son of God" takes its content from the scene.[5] Jesus, the Son of God, is from the heavenly realm. This has already been hinted at in the Son of God passages we have seen. Jesus' sonship is proclaimed by the voice at the baptism and the other worldly forces, the demons. The context of the Transfiguration interprets the words of Ps 2:7. The Son of God is a glorious light figure who is at home in the heavenly realm. As was shown in the baptism, this Son is none other than the man Jesus from Nazareth (1:9).

The larger Markan context is also important for understanding the words of the voice. The time reference, "after six days" (9:2), is a Semitic literary device that highlights

---

[1]Compare also 2 Apoc. Bar. 51:1-10. See Howard Clark Kee, "The Transfiguration in Mark: Epiphany or Apocalyptic Vision?," Understanding the Sacred Text, ed. John Reumann (Valley Forge: Judson, 1972), pp. 143-44.

[2]R. H. Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark (London: Oxford University, 1950), p. 44.

[3]Nützel, Verklärungserzählung, p. 97.

[4]Horstmann, p. 88.

[5]Nützel, Verklärungserzählung, pp. 148, 248.

a climactic development after a period of preparation.[1] Here it serves to link the Transfiguration to the preceding confession of Peter and the instruction on discipleship. Peter confessed Jesus as the Christ. The correctness of Peter's confession was indicated by the command to silence in 8:30. Now the voice from the cloud further confirms the confession. The voice echoes the words of the voice at the baptism. Jesus is the Christ. He is also God's only Son whose life, like Isaac's, will be demanded of him. To this proclamation of Jesus as the end-time king is added the injunction, "listen to him." The proclamation grounds the imperative.[2] This injunction is clearly meant to confirm Jesus' teaching on the necessity of the cross (8:31) and the call to discipleship (8:34-9:1).

The Parable of the Wicked Tenants

There are two interpretations of the parable of the wicked tenants (12:1-12). According to one, this is not a true parable but an allegory formed by the early church for apologetic purposes.[3] The allegory gives the early church's view of salvation history. The allegory is formed element by element from the history. The other interpretation maintains

---

[1]Foster R. McCurley, Jr., "'And after Six Days' (Mark 9:2): A Semitic Literary Device," JBL 93 (1974): 67-81.

[2]Nützel, Verklärungserzählung, p. 248.

[3]Werner Georg Kümmel, Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärtnern (Mk 12,1-9)," Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte: Gesammelte Aufsätze 1933-1964 (Marlburg: N.G. Elwert, 1965), pp. 207-17.

that behind the allegory there is a true parable.[1] The details of the story can be illuminated by the socio-economic conditions in Galilee in the Hellenistic period. The picture of the absentee landholder and the tenant farmers reflects accurately the agrarian conditions of the time. The sending of the slaves to claim the profits of the vineyard shows the legal difficulties such a landholder would encounter. The son would be his last effort. He would have full legal authority to act in the place of the father, and his sending would be the natural culmination of the father's efforts to claim his due.

The parable in its present form echoes three Old Testament passages.[2] The description of the planting of the vineyard in 12:1 reflects the description of the vineyard in Isa 5:1b-2. Moreover in both vineyard passages, those who are addressed in the parable are drawn into the parable

---

[1]C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961), pp. 96-102; Jeremias, Parables, pp. 70-77; Martin Hengel, "Das Gleichnis von den Weingärtnern Mc 12,1-12 im Lichte der Zenonpapyri und der rabbinischen Gleichnisse," ZNW 59 (1968): 1-39; John Dominic Crossan, "The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen," JBL 90 (1971): 451-65; Jane E. Newell and Raymond R. Newell, "The Parable of the Wicked Tenants," NT 14 (1972): 226-37.

[2]Jeremias contends that the original form of the parable has been preserved in Gospel of Thomas 65. Recent studies have shown, however, that the version of the parable in the Gospel of Thomas is dependent on Luke. Thus the form of the parable in Mark is the earliest literary form of the parable that we have. See K. R. Snodgrass, "The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen: Is the Gospel of Thomas Version the Original?," NTS 21 (1974-75): 142-44; B. Dehandschutter, "La parabole des vignerons homicides (Mc.,XII,1-12) et l'évangile selon Thomas," L'évangile selon Marc: Tradition et rédaction, Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium, vol. 34, ed. M. Sabbe (Louvain: Leuven University, 1974), pp. 203-219.

and confronted with a word of judgment (Isa 5:7; Mark 12:9). In the Isaiah passage the emphasis is on the vineyard. In Mark the emphasis has shifted to the tenants. Who are the tenants? In Isaiah the vineyard is Israel (Isa 5:7). If this is followed in Mark, then the tenants must be the leaders of Israel, in this case the Jerusalem establishment. However, then the role of the slaves is not clear. The prophets were sent to Israel, not just to the leaders. Therefore the tenants must be Israel. The vineyard has become a symbol of the privileged position of Israel. The shift has taken place to highlight the responsibility of Israel. They should have given the Lord of the vineyard the fruit of the vineyard.[1]

The repeated sending of the slaves reflects the repeated sending of the prophets. The closest parallel is Jer 7:25-28:

> And though I sent all my servants the prophets, early and late, from the day that your fathers came out of the land of Egypt even to this day, they neither listened nor inclined their ears to me, but stiffened their necks, and behaved worse than their fathers. Even though you speak all these words to them, they will not listen to you; though you call to them, they will not answer you. Therefore you shall say to them:
>
> "This is the nation that would not listen
> To the voice of the Lord its God,
> The nation that took no warning,
> And from whose mouth honesty has completely gone.
> Shear off your locks and cast them away,
> Raise a dirge on the bare heights;
> For the Lord has spurned and cast off
> The race that has roused him to wrath."

Jeremiah appears as the last prophet. In the parable the Son is the last messenger of God before the judgment. The sending of the Son is not a sending in the mythical sense from heaven.

---

[1]Blank, pp. 14-15.

It is the sending of a prophet. Linked with this is the motif of the persecution of the prophets. Two close parallels to the thought of the parable are found in Q:

> This is why the Wisdom of God said, "I will send prophets and apostles to them, and some of them they will kill and some they will persecute"--so that this age may be charged with the blood of all the prophets that has been shed since the creation of the world, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah, who perished between the altar and the sanctuary. Yes, I tell you this age will be charged with it all! (Luke 11:49-51)

> O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! murdering the prophets and stoning those who are sent to her, how often I have longed to gather your children around me, as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, but you refused! Now I leave you to yourselves. And I tell you, you will never see me again until you say, "Blessed be he who comes in the Lord's name." (Luke 13:34-35)

Both texts speak, as does the parable, of a "sending." In both the prophets are killed.[1] The second text especially talks of the attempt of Jesus to gather the children of Jerusalem. This gathering is into the kingdom, but they do not want it. The final eschatological messenger is rejected. The parallel with the parable of Mark is evident. The direct statement of the Q logion has been cast into a parable.[2]

The third Old Testament passage behind the pericope is Ps 118:22-23 which is explicitly quoted in 12:10-11. The turn that God introduces into events is the resurrection. The rejected stone has been made the corner stone of salvation.[3]

The extent of Markan redaction in the pericope is difficult to determine. Mark is responsible for the framing

---

[1]See also 1 Thes 2:14-16 and Mark 6:4.

[2]Blank, pp. 15-18; 19-26. [3]Ibid., p. 18.

verses (12:1a, 12);[1] but the parable itself probably came to him from the tradition. Mark was able to integrate the tradition into his understanding of Jesus as the "Son of God."

In the parable the title "Son of God" is again brought into relationship with the passion. Jesus is described as the "only Son" as in 1:11 and 9:7. As the final eschatological messenger, he is killed and his body thrown outside the vineyard. Jesus' ministry is also brought into relationship with the title "Son." The sending of the Son is the coming of Jesus in his ministry of confrontation. The resurrection is also drawn into relationship with the title. The title "Son" is stretched over the whole story Mark is narrating.

The Time of the End

In the final admonitions of the eschatological discourse, Jesus professes his ignorance of the time of the end, "About that day or the hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father" (13:32). "That day" is a technical expression for the parousia and goes back to the Old Testament "day of the Lord."[2] The expression is used for the day of judgment and the in-breaking of the kingdom. The time aspect is not necessarily emphasized. In the present verse, however, the time of the end is strongly emphasized by the addition of "or the hour." The main function of the verse is to correct v. 30 and to motivate the admonition

---

[1] Lambrecht, Redaktion, p. 38.

[2] Compare Luke 17:22-37.

to watch in vv. 33-37. Verse 30 states that the end is near. Verse 32 corrects this by emphasizing that the exact time of the end is known only to the Father. The verse also prepares for and motivates the admonitions to watch in vv. 33-37. Since the time of the end is not known, we must be on our guard and watch. This is stated explicitly in v. 33.[1] In the last half of the verse there is a deliberate climax. This shows at the same time the dignity of the Son and his subordination to the Father. The dignity of the Son is brought out by his taking precedence over the angels. This is further enhanced by the characterization of the angels as "in heaven." The Son on earth takes precedence over the angels in heaven.[2] The subordination of the Son to the Father is striking but not without parallel in Mark.[3]

Gethsemane

In Gethsemane Jesus prays, "Abba, Father, all things are possible to you, take this cup from me, but not what I will but what you will" (14:36). This is a model prayer fashioned on the address and one of the petitions of the Lord's prayer.[4] The address, "Abba," is characteristic of

---

[1]Lambrecht, Redaktion, p. 235.

[2]B. M. F. van Iersel, "Der Sohn" in den synoptischen Jesusworten: Christusbezeichnung der Gemeinde oder Selbstbezeichnung Jesu? (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961), p. 123.

[3]Compare 10:18; 14:36. See Lambrecht, Redaktion, pp. 231-32.

[4]Nineham, p. 392.

Jesus' prayers.[1] It expresses a deep familiarity with God.[2] It is especially significant in the context of Gethsemane. The narrative portrays Jesus as recoiling before the approaching passion (vv. 33-34). Jesus asks his Father to take away the cup. In the Old Testament the cup from God's hand most frequently means God's judgment.[3] It can also mean, though, "fate" or "destiny."[4] This is the meaning here. Jesus is praying that the fate that awaits him, the passion, may be averted. The addition of the demonstrative pronoun "this" can only point to the immediately approaching passion. This is confirmed by the cup word in 10:38 which refers to Jesus' suffering and the suffering the disciples will undergo as a result of their discipleship. Jesus prays that the cup may be removed. At the same time, though, he confesses God's power, "all things are possible to you"; and he completely subjugates himself to his Father's will, "not what I will but what you will."[5] This complete obedience to God's will has characterized Mark's portrayal of Jesus from the first mention of the passion in 8:31. During the passion itself the narrator will not pause to tell us of Jesus' attitude.

---

[1]Joachim Jeremias, "Abba," Abba: Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Reprecht, 1966), p. 59.

[2]Van Iersel, p. 109.

[3]Ps 75:9; Isa 51:17, 22; Jer 25:15-29; 49:12.

[4]Ps 11:6; 16:5.

[5]Lewis S. Hay, "The Son-of-God Christology in Mark," Journal of Bible and Religion 32 (1964): 110.

The passion itself will begin immediately after the Gethsemane pericope with the arrest (14:43-52). Before these final events begin to unfold, the narrator shows us in this prayer that Jesus went toward the passion in complete obedience to his Father's will.[1]

The Trial

At the climax of the trial before the Sanhedrin the high priest asks Jesus, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed One?" (14:61). We have seen that the question originally was simply "Are you the Christ?"[2] The phrase "the Son of the Blessed One" was a later addition. "The Blessed One" is a circumlocution for God. The expression, though, is without parallel in the Old and New Testaments. The word εὐλογητός is used only here in the New Testament as a noun.[3] There is no parallel to this usage in the Hebrew Old Testament or in the Septuagint.[4] There are also no rabbinic parallels; the only example that can be cited is 1 Enoch 77:1.[5] The expression appears to be chosen to reflect Jewish reluctance to pronounce the divine name; but it does not reflect an

---

[1]Schenke, Studien, pp. 501-507, 542-48, 553-54.

[2]See above, pp. 94-96.

[3]Matthew and Luke both avoid the expression in their parallel passages (Matt 26:63; Luke 22:70).

[4]John R. Donahue, Are You the Christ? The Trial Narrative in the Gospel of Mark, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, vol. 10 (Missoula, Mont.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973), p. 90, n. 1.

[5]Juel, pp. 78-79.

ordinary Jewish usage. We have seen this before in the Markan redactional verse 11:10.[1] The addition "the Son of the Blessed One" is probably from Mark's hand. It is another indication that "Son of God" is a messianic title for Mark.[2] This was already evident from the use of Ps 2:7 in the baptism and the Transfiguration. The fact that "the Son of the Blessed One" is put by Mark in apposition to "the Christ" should remove all doubt about the identity of the two titles. Again we have evidence that Mark is not concerned to correct one title with another. He coordinates all three of the titles. Each one may have its own nuances, but basically all three say the same thing about Jesus. The reason for this is that despite their respective backgrounds they have been filled with Christian content. All three reflect the passion, death, and resurrection of Jesus.

Jesus accepts the title "Son of God" in 14:62. His self-confession that brings about his condemnation combines Peter's confession in 8:29 and the centurion's confession in 15:39.

The Centurion's Confession

When the centurion saw how Jesus died, he said, "Truly, this man was God's Son" (15:39).[3] Although there is no article

---

[1] See above, pp. 90-92.

[2] Schenke, Der gekreuzigte Christus, p. 45.

[3] On the translation see Harold A. Guy, "Son of God in Mk. 15:39," ET 81 (1969-70): 151; Philip B. Harner, "Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns: Mark 15:39 and John 1:1," JBL 92 (1973): 81.

the predicate is definite.[1] Formally the centurion's confession is an acclamation.[2] The adverb "truly" probably also reflects the acclamation style.[3] The centurion is giving the Christian confession that Jesus is the Son of God. He is affirming what Jesus himself affirmed during the trial before the Sanhedrin. The context of the centurion's confession shows us how Mark understood it. The title on the cross is "The King of the Jews" (15:26). The taunt of the chief priests and the scribes is directed to "the Christ, the king of Israel" (15:32). Thus the centurion's acclamation, "Truly, this man was God's Son," is a messianic confession. The centurion expresses what the high priest considered blasphemy, the Christian confession of Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God. The centurion's confession echoes the voice from heaven at the baptism and the Transfiguration. This is the third great Son of God passage. It dominates the end of the gospel as the first two dominated its beginning and middle.[4]

Mark does not mean simply to identify Jesus as the Son of God. This has been done earlier. Here it is a question of a public confession of Jesus. The messianic secret is broken first by Jesus before the Sanhedrin and before Pilate;

---

[1]Colwell, pp. 12-21; Robert G. Bratcher, "A Note on υἱὸς θεοῦ (Mark xv.39)," ET 68 (1956-57): 27-28.

[2]Schenke, Der gekreuzigte Christus, p. 108, n. 5.

[3]Erik Peterson, ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ: Epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, n.s., vol. 24 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926), p. 318.

[4]Vielhauer, "Erwägungen," pp. 163-65.

now it is broken publicly by the centurion. All three passages focus on Jesus' death, the term or limit of the secret. It is significant that the confession is made by a gentile army officer. That it is an outsider and not a representative of Israel is a polemical point of the narrative. The community of the crucified Christ is the community of outcasts and the poor, and it is open to the gentiles.[1] It is also significant that the confession is not made by a disciple. Faced with the passion the disciples all fled. Only some women look on from a distance. It is a sign of the total failure of the disciples and their falling into unbelief that no one of them stands under the cross to make the confession. At Caesarea Philippi Peter confessed Jesus as the Christ. Faced with the passion he denied that he even knew him.

Mark is trying to say something about the kind of Son of God Jesus is. He does this by linking the confession to the crucifixion. The introductory phrases bring this out: "But the centurion who stood opposite him, seeing that he died in this way, said..." (15:39). The cross is the full revelation of the Son of God.[2] The confession is the climax of the crucifixion scene.[3]

---

[1]Schenke, Der gekreuzigte Christus, p. 109.

[2]Nützel, Verklärungserzählung, pp. 214-15.

[3]The separation of tradition and redaction in 15:39 is extremely difficult. On the one hand, it seems unlikely that the traditional crucifixion scene would end with the recounting of Jesus' death (v. 37). Verse 38 is perhaps possible as an ending, but v. 39 is much more suitable. On the other hand, v. 39 fits perfectly into Mark's Christological conception. We leave the question open.

Conclusions

Although all three titles, Christ, Son of God, Son of Man, are important for Mark, Son of God is probably the most important title. It appears in three key passages at the beginning (1:11), the center (9:7), and the end (15:39) of the gospel. It is part of the high priest's question in 14:61, and Jesus affirms it with his clear "yes" (14:62). It also appears in an important theological statement about Jesus' life, death, and resurrection (12:6).

The background of the term is primarily royal messianism. This is brought out clearly by the use of Ps 2:7 in the baptism and the Transfiguration, by the apposition with the title "Christ" in the high priest's question, and by the context of the centurion's confession. The Son of God is not just a messianic title; it is an interpretation of the title Christ. It emphasizes Jesus' election (1:11). Just as the sonship of Israel and the king expressed their election by Yahweh, so Jesus as Son of God is God's chosen one. Sonship also implies obedience, and Mark is careful to bring this out, especially in Gethsemane.

Jesus, though, transcends all messianic categories. Mark is careful to indicate that the Son of God is a supernatural figure. The Son of God is the title that the supernatural agents in the gospel use when addressing Jesus. In each of the great Son of God passages, the baptism, the Transfiguration, and the crucifixion scene, there are supernatural phenomena that indicate that the new aeon is breaking in

with Jesus.

But most important of all, Mark brings the title Son of God into relationship with the passion. Jesus is characterized as "only Son" in 1:11; 9:7; and 12:6. This reflects the "only son" of the Old Testament, Isaac. In the parable of the wicked tenants the son is the last in a long line of persecuted and murdered messengers.

The title "Son of God" like the title "Christ" stands completely under the messianic secret. Jesus alone hears the voice at the baptism. The demons are silenced and the disciples are forbidden to tell what they have seen on the mountain. Who Jesus is is a secret. Jesus himself discloses the secret at his trial, and the centurion confesses his sonship at the foot of the cross. It is only at the foot of the cross that this is possible, for the crucifixion contains the full revelation of Jesus as the Son of God.

Jesus responds to Peter's confession by beginning to teach that the Son of Man must suffer. The Son of Man theme is closely tied to the confession. We turn now to examine the Son of Man theme in Mark.

CHAPTER IV

SON OF MAN

The Caesarea Philippi pericope marks a break in the narrative of the gospel. After Peter's confession Jesus begins to speak openly about the suffering of the Son of Man. This theme will be unfolded in the second half of the gospel. Important aspects of Mark's understanding of Jesus and his mission are expressed in this theme. A study of the theme will help us to grasp some of the elements that would go into a response to the question, "But you, who do you say I am?"

The expression "the Son of Man" occurs fourteen times in Mark's gospel. There are three references to a future coming of the Son of Man (8:38; 13:26; 14:62), two references to the authority of the Son of Man on earth (2:10, 28), and nine references to the suffering, death, and resurrection of the Son of Man (8:31; 9:9, 12, 31; 10:33-34, 45; 14:21 bis, 41). The saying in 3:28-29 should also be considered, for although the Markan form does not contain the expression "Son of Man" the Q form of the saying does (Luke 12:10//Matt 12:32).

The term "the Son of Man" always occurs in sayings of Jesus. This distinguishes it sharply from the titles "Christ" and "Son of God." The latter two titles are confessional titles. Jesus is confessed as "Christ" (8:29) and

"Son of God" (15:39). "Son of Man," on the other hand, never appears as a predicate applied to Jesus. It always occurs in sayings of Jesus, often where we would expect a simple "I."

The Greek expression used in Mark and the synoptics generally for the Son of Man is ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.[1] This expression does not make sense in Greek; it is only explicable as the literal translation of the Aramaic idiom bar ʾĕnāšʾā. In the New Testament period the indeterminate form bar ʾĕnāš could mean "a human being" or "someone."[2]

The research into the synoptic Son of Man sayings has been dominated by the question of authenticity. Did Jesus refer to the Son of Man? If he did, was he referring to someone else or was he cryptically referring to himself? Which of the Son of Man sayings go back to Jesus? These questions have not been answered to everyone's satisfaction. The usual procedure is to divide the sayings into three groups: future Son of Man sayings, sayings that refer to the present activity of the Son of Man, and Son of Man passion sayings. Most commonly authentic sayings are found only among the future Son of Man sayings.[3] Schweizer maintains that only the sayings that

---

[1]Outside of the synoptics we find υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου (nominative: John 5:27; Heb 2:6; accusative: Rev 1:13).

[2]Fitzmyer, "Qumran Aramaic," p. 397.

[3]Heinz E. Tödt, The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition, trans. Dorothea M. Barton (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965); Hahn, pp. 15-67; A. J. B. Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man (London: Lutterworth, 1964); Carston Colpe, "ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου," TDNT, vol. 8, ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1972), pp. 400-477.

refer to the present activity of the Son of Man have a claim to be authentic.[1] Vielhauer uses Sharman's observation that there seems to be no connection between the Son of Man and the kingdom of God to deny authenticity to all synoptic Son of Man sayings.[2]

As important as this question of authenticity is, it lies beyond the scope of this dissertation. We will attempt to discover Mark's understanding of the Son of Man. After examining the background of the title, we will study the sayings about the Son of Man on earth (2:10, 28), the first passion prediction (8:31; 9:9, 12), the coming Son of Man saying (8:38), the further passion predications (9:31; 10:33-34, 45), the parousia saying (13:26), the sayings in the passion (14:21, 41), and the trial saying (14:62).

Apocalyptic Background

The ultimate background of the term "Son of Man" may

---

[1]Eduard Schweizer, "Der Menschensohn," Neotestamentica: German and English Essays 1951-1963 (Zürich and Stuttgart: Zwingli, 1963), pp. 56-84.

[2]Philipp Vielhauer, "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu," Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1965), pp. 55-91. Sharman summarizes his observation: "Within the synoptic record of the teaching of Jesus, no single feature is so unexpected, so arresting, and so deeply impressive as the fact that neither of the two outstanding phrases within that teaching, namely, Son of Man and Kingdom of God, seems to bear any relationship whatever to the other in the course of the exposition of the thought. They create the impression of two foci that do not belong to the same ellipse....The Son of Man has no kingdom and the Kingdom of God has no Son of Man." Henry Burton Sharman, Son of Man and Kingdom of God: A Critical Study (New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1943), p. 89. See further, I. H. Marshall, "The Synoptic Son of Man Sayings in Recent Discussion," NTS 12 (1965-66): 335-37.

be in royal First Man concepts.[1] There was Jewish interest in the First Man.[2] However, the immediate background of the synoptic Son of Man sayings lies in Jewish apocalyptic. In Dan 7:2-8 the four world empires that have oppressed God's people are seen in a vision as four grotesque beasts.[3] In contrast to these beasts one like a Son of Man[4] approaches the Ancient of Days and receives kingdom, glory, and dominion from him (Dan 7:9-14). The human figure is identified with the saints of the Most High in the interpretation of the vision in vv. 15-27. This interpretation is later than the vision in vv. 9-14.[5] The vision may be based on a myth, probably of Canaanite origin, that recounts the transfer of authority from an old god (El) to a young god (Baal), although certainty on this is not possible.[6]

---

[1]Frederick Houk Borsch, The Son of Man in Myth and History (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967), pp. 55-231.

[2]Robin Scroggs, The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), pp. 1-58.

[3]The book of Daniel was composed in the period 167-163 B.C. in response to the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. See Eissfeldt, pp. 520-22.

[4]Aramaic: k^{e}bar ʾĕnāš; Greek: ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου.

[5]L. Dequeker finds evidence that two redactors have reworked the original vision of Dan 7. According to him the two redactors have different understandings of the saints. For the first redactor the saints were heavenly beings or angels. He used the term of the original vision "the saints of the Most High." The second redactor used the simple term "saints" and meant by it the Israelites. See Joseph Coppens and Luc Dequeker, Le Fils de l'homme et les Saints du Très-Haut en Daniel, VII, dans les Apocryphes et dans le Nouveau Testament Analecta louvaniensia biblica et orientalia, series 3, vol. 23, 2nd ed. (Gembloux: Duculot, 1961), pp. 33-54.

[6]Leonhard Rost, "Zur Deutung des Menschensohnes in

In the Similitudes of Enoch (1 Enoch 37-71) the vision of Daniel is taken up (46:1) and expounded. The Son of Man[1] has become the end-time judge (46:2-8). He is preexistent before creation (48:2); he is a support to the righteous (48:4) and a source of sorrow to the great ones of the earth (62:5). He is hidden from the beginning but revealed to the righteous who will be saved and who will live with the Son of Man in glory (62:13-16). The righteous are blessed because the name of the Son of Man has been revealed to them (69:26). The Son of Man is none other than the translated Enoch (71:14-17). In the Similitudes the Son of Man is a transcendental figure. The similarity of the Son of Man in the Similitudes and some aspects of the Son of Man in the New Testament is intriguing. However, the date of the Similitudes is not certain. Sjöberg dates them somewhere in the last decades of the first century before Christ or in the early decades of the Christian era.[2] However, this is too early. No fragments of the Similitudes have been found

---

Daniel 7," Gott und die Götter: Festgabe für Erich Fascher zum 60.Geburtstag, ed. Gerhard Delling (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1958), pp. 41-43; Colpe, pp. 415-19; Borsch, The Son of Man in Myth and History, pp. 140-43.

[1]Three Ethiopic terms are used: walda sab'e, "descendant of man"; walda 'equāla 'emaḥeyāw, "descendant of the race of those born of woman"; and walda be'esī, "descendant of man." Characteristic of the Similitudes is the use of the demonstrative pronoun with "Son of Man." For example, we find "that Son of Man" in 46:2 and 48:2 and "this Son of Man" in 46:4. The Similitudes also speak of the Elect One (for example, 39:6; 40:5, 45:3, 4). The Elect One and the Son of Man appear to be identical. See Colpe, pp. 423-27.

[2]Erik Sjöberg, Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch, Acta Reg. Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis, vol. 41 (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946), p. 39.

among the Enoch material discovered at Qumran. Although this is only a negative indication, it should caution us against using the Similitudes as the pre-Christian Jewish apocalyptic background of the New Testament Son of Man texts. It is even possible that the Similitudes must be dated as late as the early second century.[1]

The Son of Man on Earth

The story of the healing of the paralytic (2:1-12) is not a literary unit. An original miracle story (vv. 3-5a + 11-12; vv. 1-2 are predominately redactional) has been expanded by an addition (vv. 5b-10) that climaxes in a saying that affirms the Son of Man's authority to forgive sins. The main arguments in support of this secondary expansion are the sudden appearance of the scribes in v. 6 and their equally sudden disappearance, the double use of λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ in vv. 5 and 10 which allows the vv. 5b-10 to be excised while still leaving an intelligible narrative, and the lack of any reference to forgiveness of sins except in the insertion.[2] The insertion changes the narrative from a straightforward miracle story to a teaching pericope with Christological interest.[3] The climax is reached in v. 10, "...but in order that you may know that the Son of Man has the authority to

---

[1] J. C. Hindley, "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch: An Historical Approach," NTS 14 (1967-68): 551-65.

[2] Maisch, pp. 29-39. For the view that the story is a unit, see Richard T. Mead, "The Healing of the Paralytic--a Unit?," JBL 80 (1961): 348-54.

[3] Maisch, pp. 81-85, 101-104.

forgive sins on earth..." The statement has no parallel in contemporary Judaism. Nowhere is it claimed that the Messiah or any other figure would have the authority to forgive sins.[1] This is the prerogative of God alone.[2] Therefore the scribes react to Jesus' statement that the man's sins are forgiven with the charge, "He blasphemes, who can forgive sins but God alone?" (2:7). To the question "Who but God?" Jesus answers "The Son of Man!" The extraordinary claim that is made means that we must take Son of Man here as a title. It is not possible that the sense of the saying is that Jesus has the authority to forgive sins just as any man would have the authority to forgive sins.[3] The extreme Christological concentration of the whole passage and the saying in particular necessitates taking Son of Man as a title.[4] The title, though, is mysterious. The authority of the Son of Man is contested. It is not self-evident that the Son of Man has the authority to forgive sins. This must be proven.[5] The title expresses

---

[1]Tödt, p. 129; Joachim Gnilka, "Das Elend vor dem Menschensohn (Mk 2,1-12)," Jesus und der Menschensohn: Für Anton Vögtle, ed. Rudolf Pesch and Rudolf Schnackenburg with Odilo Kaiser (Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1975), p. 202.

[2]Compare Isa 43:25. [3]Colpe, p. 433.

[4]Hahn, p. 35; Maisch, pp. 90-101; Karl Kertelge, "Die Vollmacht des Menschensohnes zur Sündenvergebung (Mk 2,10)," Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker, ed. Paul Hoffmann with Norbert Brox and Wilhelm Pesch (Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1973), p. 211; Gnilka, "Elend," pp. 205-207.

[5]The Son of Man saying is directed to the scribes; it is not an aside to Mark's readers as maintained by Christian P. Ceroke, "Is Mark 2,10a a Saying of Jesus?," CBQ 22 (1960): 369-90; G. H. Boobyer, "Mark II,10a and the Interpretation of the Healing of the Paralytic," HTR 47 (1954): 115-20; Lewis S. Hay, "The Son of Man in Mark 2:10 and 2:28," JBL 89 (1970): 71.

the God-like authority of Jesus, but this authority and Jesus' dignity are hidden. "The Son of Man" is a mystery title that brings to expression this hidden, contested authority. Mark appears to use Son of Man in correspondence to Son of God to designate Jesus as the hidden divine being in his historical existence.[1] The addition ἐπι τῆς γῆς appears to bring this out. Jesus has the authority on earth that God in heaven has. The title "Son of Man" is used as a self-designation of Jesus.[2] What is being questioned is Jesus' authority. Instead of responding with a statement like "...in order that you may know that I have the authority to forgive...," Jesus uses the title "Son of Man" to express the hidden authority he possesses.

The Son of Man saying in 2:28 confirms the interpretation of the saying in 2:10. Mark has interpolated the two sayings in 2:27-28 between the two Sabbath pericopes of the plucking of the grain (2:23-26) and the cure of the man with the withered hand (3:1-6). He adds the sayings with his typical connecting

---

[1]Paul Hoffman, "Mk 8,31: Zur Herkunft und markinischen Rezeption einer alten Überlieferung," Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker, ed. Paul Hoffmann with Norbert Brox and Wilhelm Pesch (Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1973), p. 199.

[2]Mark uses the Greek expression ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου as a self-designation for Jesus. We do not enter here into the question whether bar ʾĕnāš can be used in Aramaic as a surrogate for "I." On this question see Geza Vermes, "Appendix E: The Use of bar nas/bar nasa in Jewish Aramaic," in Matthew Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 3rd ed., (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), pp. 310-28; Fitzmyer, "Qumran Aramaic," p. 397.

formula καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς.[1] The two sayings were originally separate. The meaning of the first is that man and man's needs take precedence over the Sabbath. There is an apparent Jewish parallel in the saying, "To you is the Sabbath given; you are not given to the Sabbath."[2] However, the Jewish saying refers only to a matter of life or death. The Sabbath can be violated to save a life, but all other work to help a man in need must wait for the end of the Sabbath.[3] The Jewish saying would not cover the cases under discussion here. The saying in v. 27 raises man over the Sabbath.[4] In v. 28 this is linked to the Son of Man. The result of the precedence given to man over the Sabbath is that the Son of Man is lord even of the Sabbath. Again the claim is extraordinary, and Mark draws attention to it. The splitting of κύριος and καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου emphasizes both.[5] Again the lordship of the Son of Man is contested (2:24; 3:2). Authority over the Sabbath is a prerogative of God. This extraordinary divine authority is present in the man Jesus. This is expressed in the Son of Man title. The authority is hidden, concealed in the human Jesus, and the mysterious Son of Man title expresses this. There is a close

---

[1]Tödt, p. 130; Morna D. Hooker, The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the Term "Son of Man" and its Use in St Mark's Gospel (London: SPCK, 1967), p. 98.

[2]Mekilta 109b on Exod 31:13.

[3]Eduard Lohse, "Jesu Worte über den Sabbat," Judentum--Urchristentum--Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, vol. 26, ed. Walther Eltester (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1960), p. 85.

[4]Ibid. [5]Zerwick, p. 126.

connection in vv. 27-28 between "man" and "Son of Man." In Mark the two terms are often linked together and the mention of one frequently triggers a reference to the other.[1]

In the Beelzebul controversy Mark has a saying (3:28-29) that in its Q form (Luke 12:10//Matt 12:32) speaks of the Son of Man. Following Lambrecht we can reconstruct the Q form of the saying:[2]

πᾶς ὃς ἐρει λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· ὃς δ' ἀν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται.

The parallelism is Semitic. Mark breaks the parallelism with additions at the end of both v. 28 and v. 29. Mark has added the introductory phrase ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, the term "sin" in vv. 28 and 29, and the emphasis on eternal guilt in v. 29. He changes the second ἀφεθήσεται to ἔχει ἄφεσιν, and he does not use the Q expression "to speak against." But the most significant change in the present context is that Mark does not mention the Son of Man. Instead he talks about all things being forgiven the sons of men, using an unusual double plural that reflects the Q reference to the Son of Man.[3] Mark did not want to say that speaking against the Son of Man could be forgiven. If the Son of Man has authority that approaches that of God, then opposition to the Son of Man is not something that can be forgiven.[4] This is another instance of the

---

[1]Compare 3:28-29; 8:27, 33, and 8:31; 8:36, 37, and 8:38; 9:31; 14:21. See Lambrecht, Marcus Interpretator, p. 66.

[2]Lambrecht, Marcus Interpretator, pp. 65-66.

[3]Ibid., pp. 66-67. [4]Tödt, p. 120.

close connection between "man" and "Son of Man" in Mark. The redaction of the Q saying confirms our preliminary understanding of the title "Son of Man" in Mark. The title points to the great dignity of Jesus, but this dignity is concealed in his humanness.

The First Passion Prediction

Immediately after Peter's confession and the command to silence Jesus begins to teach the disciples that the Son of Man must suffer many things and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes and be killed and after three days rise (8:31). This prediction of the Son of Man's death and resurrection after three days is repeated with significant variation but also obvious parallelism in 9:31 and 10:33-34. The origin of these three great passion predictions, their relationship to one another, and their function within Mark's gospel is the subject of a continuing discussion. Pesch maintains that they are all part of the pre-Markan passion narrative.[1] Strecker[2] and Hoffmann[3] claim that there is a traditional saying at the base of 8:31. Perrin feels that all three passion predictions were formed by Mark from

---

[1]Rudolf Pesch, "Die Passion des Menschensohnes: Eine Studie zu den Menschensohnworten der vormarkinischen Passionsgeschichte," Jesus und der Menschensohn: Für Anton Vögtle, ed. Rudolf Pesch and Rudolf Schnackenburg with Odilo Kaiser (Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1975), pp. 168-73, 176-81.

[2]Georg Strecker, "The Passion- and Resurrection Predictions in Mark's Gospel (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:32-34)," Interpretation 22 (1968): 429-33.

[3]Hoffmann, "Mk 8,31," pp. 175-84.

traditional material.[1] The discussion has not come to rest, and a renewed sifting of the evidence is necessary.

The first prediction is formulated with a single unified construction. An accusative with the infinitive construction in which the Son of Man is the subject of four infinitives depends on δεῖ:[2]

δεῖ
τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
πολλὰ παθεῖν
καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑ.τ.πρεσβυτέρων κ.τ.ἀρχιερέων κ.τ.γραμ.
καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι
καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι.

The second of the four predicates is overloaded with the addition of "by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes." This has led Horstmann and Hoffmann to excise the disturbing phrase as a Markan redactional addition.[3] The sequence of the predicates is then smoother, but there is still a problem. "To be rejected" does not fit after "to suffer many things." "To suffer many things" seems to be a general term that summarizes the sufferings of the passion. To have Jesus' rejection which refers to a specific event after the inclusive, generalizing term is jarring. Besides the verb ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι is a reference to Ps 118:22 LXX which Mark quotes in 12:10 and refers to in 9:12. Its purpose is to show that the necessity of the passion is a necessity that comes from the scriptures. But this conformity of the passion to the scrip-

---

[1]Perrin, "Interpretation," pp. 14-30.

[2]Hoffmann, "Mk 8,31," p. 176.

[3]Horstmann, p. 25; Hoffmann, "Mk 8,31," pp. 177-78.

tures is a Markan concern.[1] Therefore Hoffmann eliminates ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι also as Markan redaction. With these excisions Hoffmann believes he has arrived at the pre-Markan tradition.[2] However, the problems still remain. Hoffmann does not suggest a Sitz im Leben for the resulting formula. In its reconstructed form in the present tense it has a predictive function, and it fits perfectly into the Markan context.[3] Pesch, who holds that the entire 8:31 is traditional, does assign it a Sitz im Leben in the pre-Markan passion narrative.[4] However, it is by no means clear that the passion narrative reaches back as far as 8:31; and as we have seen, the frame of 8:31 is completely redactional.[5] It is Mark who has placed the saying here. It remains a theoretical possibility that behind the prediction in Mark is a traditional kerygmatic formula in the past tense that stated that it was necessary that the Son of Man suffer many things, be killed, and rise after three days. However, there is no evidence for such a form of the kerygma independent of the gospel of Mark. There does not seem to be any reason why the entire prediction could not be Markan redaction. As we have seen ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι is a reference to Ps 118:22 LXX which Mark quotes fully in 12:10. This reference to the

---

[1] 9:12; 12:10-11; 14:21, 49. See Schenke, Studien, pp. 261-62.

[2] Hoffmann, "Mk 8,31," pp. 178-79.

[3] Perrin, "Interpretation," pp. 20-22.

[4] Pesch, "Passion," p. 173.

[5] See above, pp. 50-51.

scriptures means that the necessity that is mentioned in the δεῖ is a necessity that comes from the scriptures.[1] This is a concern of Mark as we have seen. The explicit naming of the three groups of Jesus' enemies occurs also in 11:27; 14:43; 14:53; and 15:1.[2] The full reference to all three groups that make up the Sanhedrin is to be expected here in the first prediction.[3] The verb ἀποκτείνω, besides its use in the three passion predictions, occurs in 3:4; 6:19; 12:5 bis, 7, 8; 14:1. The verb is linked in the New Testament with the motif of the persecution and killing of the prophets,[4] a theme and a usage that is familiar to Mark (compare 6:19, the four occurrences in the parable of the wicked tenants, and 14:1).[5] The phrase "after three days" is Markan. Mark has similar time references in 9:2 and 14:1. Strecker claims that the time expression "after three days" conflicts both with the usual reference to the resurrection "on the third day" which is found in the parallel passages in Matthew and Luke and in 1 Cor 15:4 and also with Mark's own passion account according to which Jesus rose on the third day.[6]

---

[1]Hahn, p. 40; Horstmann, p. 25. On δεῖ see Erich Fascher, "Theologische Beobachtungen zu δεῖ," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche vol. 21, ed. Walther Eltester (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954), pp. 228-54.

[2]At least 14:53 is redactional.

[3]Hoffmann, "Mk 8,31," p. 177, n. 35.

[4]Rom 11:3; 1 Thes 2:15; Acts 3:15; 7:52. See Perrin, "Interpretation," p. 26.

[5]14:1 is redactional. [6]Strecker, "Predictions," p. 429.

For Mark, though, the expression μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας means "on the third day." The redactional time reference μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας in 14:1 means "on the next day" as a comparison with 14:12 shows.[1] The time reference is consistent with Mark's passion narrative and is typical of Mark's style.[2]

The elements of the first passion prediction that we have examined--the use of ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι with its implied reference to the scriptural necessity of the passion, the full listing of Jesus' enemies, the use of ἀποκτείνω and μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας--all point to Markan redaction. The other elements, though not clearly pointing to Markan redaction, do not pose any serious obstacles to considering the entire prediction Markan. Mark uses δεῖ in 9:11; 13:7, 10, 14; 14:31, although not with the precise nuance found here except in 9:11. The word is suited, though, for use in the first passion prediction in which Mark wants to emphasize the necessity of the passion that comes from the scriptures. Mark ordinarily uses ἐγείρω when referring to Jesus' resurrection (14:28; 16:6). However, ἀνίστημι is used elsewhere of Jesus' resurrection (1 Thes 4:14), and the fact that unlike ἐγείρω it can be used intransitiviely made it eminently suitable for use here to express the power of the Son of Man who is not raised but who rises.[3] The expression πολλὰ παθεῖν probably originated in concepts surrounding the suffering just man and came to Mark

---

[1]Schenke, Studien, pp. 24-25.

[2]Besides 9:2, 31; 10:34; 14:1, compare 1:14 and 14:28.

[3]Hahn, p. 39; Perrin, "Interpretation," pp. 26-27.

from this tradition.[1] The phrase is used by Mark to describe the sufferings of the hemorrhaging woman in 5:26. The entire prediction makes sense as Markan redaction.

The Son of Man concept that is expressed in this first passion prediction confirms our preliminary conclusion that the Son of Man is a mysterious title for Mark that combines the divine dignity of Jesus and his all too vulnerable humanness. The Son of Man rises; there is ultimate vindication. But first he suffers, is rejected and killed. Just as his authority which was expressed in 2:10, 28, was contested, so here the Son of Man is opposed and rejected. All of this is part of God's will as revealed in the scriptures. Here, too, the Son of Man title stands in the place of the "I" of Jesus. When Jesus begins to speak of his suffering, it is in terms of the suffering of the Son of Man whose dignity is concealed in the man Jesus.

In the passage that records the conversation that took place on the descent from the mountain of the Transfiguration (9:9-13), Mark twice refers back to the first passion prediction. In the command to silence (9:9), Jesus orders the disciples not to tell what they have seen except when the Son of Man has risen from the dead. This refers back to the fourth predicate of the first passion prediction. What is interesting here is the coordination of Son of God and Son of Man. Jesus' true dignity is expressed in the title Son of God which is filled with content in the Transfiguration scene. This cannot

---

[1]Hoffmann, "Mk 8,31," pp. 181-82; Pesch, "Passion," pp. 168-69.

be told before the Son of Man rises from the dead. The evident dignity of the Son of God revealed as a heavenly light figure corresponds to the hidden dignity of the Son of Man who first through the passion comes to the resurrection.

When the disciples ask about Elijah's coming, Jesus answers, "Elijah, coming first restores all things, and how is it written about the Son of Man that he should suffer many things and be treated with contempt?" (9:12). This saying also clearly refers back to the first passion prediction. The phrase πολλὰ πάθῃ picks up πολλὰ παθεῖν and ἐξουδενηθῆναι is a translation variant for ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι.[1] The reference to scripture that was implied in 8:31 is now explicit in γέγραπται. The disciples are asking about the order of events at the end-time. Jesus answers that Elijah does come first (9:12a), indeed he has already come (9:13a) and been destroyed as the scriptures foretold (9:13b)! The scriptures also foretell another event in the eschatological drama--the suffering and ill-treatment of the Son of Man (9:12b). Since the two references to the Son of Man in 9:9 and 9:12 refer back to the redactional 8:31, they are also redactional.

The Son of Man's Coming

The coming of the Son of Man is mentioned for the first time in a series of sayings on discipleship that closes the Caesarea Philippi episode: "For whoever is ashamed of me and

---

[1]Compare Acts 4:11 and Mark 12:10. See Tödt, pp. 161-170; Hahn, p. 41; Horstmann, p. 135, n. 160; Hoffmann, "Mk 8,31," p. 179, n. 39; Pesch, "Passion," p. 174.

my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of Man will also be ashamed of him when he comes in his Father's glory with the holy angels" (8:38). Matthew and Luke both have a modified form of this saying in the parallel passages.[1] In addition, they both preserve a Q form of the saying. Luke formulates the Q saying: "Whoever confesses me before men, the Son of Man will also confess him before the angels of God; but one denying me before men will be denied before the angels of God" (Luke 12:8-9). Matthew's version of the Q saying is somewhat different: "Whoever confesses me before men, I will confess before my Father in heaven; whoever denies me before men, I will also deny before my Father in heaven" (Matt 10:32-33). The most striking difference between the two sayings is that in Matthew the double saying is an I-saying and in Luke it is a Son of Man saying. The subject of the Q form of the saying was the Son of Man. The main reason for this is that the Lukan form seems to imply a distinction between Jesus and the Son of Man. Matthew avoids this. His "I" is an obvious secondary attempt to smooth over a difficulty in the original saying.[2] Another indication that Matthew's

---

[1]Matt 16:27 and Luke 9:26. Luke introduces some changes in the saying. He omits the reference to the adulterous and sinful generation and he changes the final phrase to "in his glory and the glory of his Father and of the holy angels." Matthew redacts the saying radically. His changes are motivated by two considerations. He wants to eliminate any possibility of distinguishing between Jesus and the Son of Man, and he wants to bring the saying into conformity with his understanding of the coming of the Son of Man (see especially Matt 25:31-46).

[2]Frederick Houk Borsch, The Christian and Gnostic Son of Man, Studies in Biblical Theology, 2nd series, vol. 14 (Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1970), pp. 16-20; Angus

version is secondary is the Markan form of the saying which is also a Son of Man saying. A second difference between Matthew and Luke is in the sentence structure. Matthew has two fully parallel sentences whereas Luke has a much shorter second sentence with an aorist participle replacing the dependent clause and a passive verb in the main clause. Luke has here changed the original structure, adapting the second statement to the form of Luke 12:10 which has both main verbs in the passive. Finally, Matthew has "before my Father in heaven" and Luke "before the angels of God" at the end of both parts of the double saying. Matthew alone speaks of "my Father in heaven" so it is more probable that Luke here preserves the Q form of the ending.[1] We can now reconstruct the Q form of the saying:

πᾶς ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων,
καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τ.ἀνθρώπου ὁμολγήσει ἐ.αὐτῷ ἔμ.τ.ἀγγέλων τ.θεοῦ·
ὃς δ' ἂν ἀρνήσηταί με ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων,
καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τ.ἀνθρώπου ἀρνήσεται αὐτὸν ἔμ.τ.ἀγγέλων τ.θεοῦ.

A comparison with the Markan form of the saying is now possible. Mark reproduces only the second, negative half of the double saying. The reason for this is to be found in the use that Mark makes of the saying. It concludes a series of five sayings on discipleship that are linked to each other by

---

J. B. Higgins, "'Menschensohn' oder 'ich' in Q: Lk 12,8-9/ Mt 10,32-33?," Jesus und der Menschensohn: Für Anton Vögtle, ed. Rudolf Pesch and Rudolf Schnackenburg with Odilo Kaiser (Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1975), pp. 117-123; Werner Georg Kümmel, "Das Verhalten Jesus gegenüber und das Verhalten des Menschensohns," Jesus und der Menschensohn: Für Anton Vögtle, ed. Rudolf Pesch and Rudolf Schnackenburg with Odilo Kaiser (Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1975), p. 215.

[1]Kümmel, "Verhalten," p. 215.

γάρ.[1] The Markan saying is a warning about the consequences of not following this teaching; therefore the positive half of the double saying would not suit Mark's purpose and so he omits it. The Q saying talks only about the relationship to Jesus. Mark, on the other hand, talks about the relationship to Jesus and his words. The expression καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους disturbs the correspondence between the "I" of Jesus in the dependent clause and the Son of Man in the main clause. The addition is a secondary insertion of Mark. Similar Markan insertions are found in 10:29 and, in the immediate context, in 8:35.[2] The reason for the insertion is to be found in the Markan context. Mark is emphasizing the importance both of the passion prediction in 8:31 and the sayings on discipleship in 8:34-37. This addition of "and my words" has prompted a further change. Instead of Q's ἀρνέομαι Mark uses ἐπαισχύνομαι in both clauses. The latter verb fits better the Markan addition "and my words" as it is used to describe one's relationship to the gospel.[3] In the place of Q's "before men" Mark has "in this adulterous and sinful generation." The Markan expression is secondary. In Q there is the formal correspondence of "before men" and "before the angels of God." The Markan expression has an archaic ring to it. What we have

---

[1]The saying in 9:1 is a further addition to this collection, but it is to a certain extent set off from the other sayings by the introductory formula καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς.

[2]Compare also 13:31. See Horstmann, pp. 43-44; Kümmel, "Verhalten," p. 213.

[3]Rom 1:16; 2 Tim 1:8, 12, 16. See Horstmann, pp. 44-45.

here is a conscious biblicizing.[1] We have noticed before Mark's attempts to use Jewish language.[2] Finally, Mark has completely recast the conclusion of the main clause. In the place of Q's "before the angels of God" Mark has "when he comes in his Father's glory with the holy angels." The mention of the angels in both forms of the saying is another indication that Mark is redacting the Q form of the saying. However, Mark's redaction is radical in this part of the saying. In Q the angels form the heavenly court. The Son of Man stands over against them as a witness.[3] In Mark the angels are subordinate to the Son of Man.[4] The Son of Man himself is no longer a witness but the end-time judge. The figure of the Son of Man is described as coming "in his Father's glory." This phrase is another clue that helps us to understand what Mark means by the Son of Man. At first glance, Mark seems to have an exalted understanding of the Son of Man. In Q the Son of Man has the rather unpretentious role of witness; whereas in Mark he comes as the end-time judge. This first impression is deceptive, however. In Q the Son of Man is not qualified. It is taken for granted that the reader knows who the Son of Man is, and the title itself is sufficient to characterize him as an eschatological figure. In Mark, on the other hand, the title "Son of Man"

---

[1]Compare Isa 1:4; Hos 1:2; Jer 3:3; Ezek 16:32. See also Matt 12:39. See Horstmann, pp. 45-46.

[2]The attempts are not always successful. See above, pp. 91, 131-32.

[3]Tödt, p. 56; Horstmann, pp. 46-47.

[4]Compare 1:13; 13:27, 32.

by itself is not sufficient to designate an eschatological figure. For this a further qualification is necessary. Here this further qualification is the phrase "in his Father's glory."[1] For Mark the Son of Man primarily expresses Jesus' dignity in a hidden, mysterious way, concealed by his humanity. To express the eschatological role of the Son of Man a further qualification must be added to the title.[2] The glory of the Son of Man is the glory of his Father. Here is another indication of the coordination of the three main titles of Jesus in Mark. This is the first mention of the parousia in Mark. It is significant that what will be decisive at the judgment is one's acceptance or non-acceptance of Jesus' teaching on the cross and discipleship. The parousia is oriented toward the gospel.

This saying juxtaposes the "I" of Jesus and the Son of Man. The illusion is even created by the use of both in the same sentence that a distinction must be made between them. Whatever may be said about the original intent of Luke 12:8-9 and the reconstructed Q form of the saying, for Mark Jesus and the Son of Man are identical. This is clear from 2:10, 28; 8:31. What is being established in this saying is a connection between one's relationship to Jesus and his words and the Son of Man's end-time judgment. A break with Jesus means a break with the Son of Man.[3]

---

[1]Compare 10:37; 13:26; 14:62.

[2]Hoffmann, "Mk 8,31," pp. 198-200.

[3]Tödt, p. 42.

Further Passion Predictions

The second passion prediction is a two-part saying, "The Son of Man is handed over into the hands of men and they will kill him; and having been killed, after three days he will rise" (9:31). The repetition of "kill" divides the saying into two parts. In the first part the emphasis is on the Son of Man's being handed over into the hands of men. The result is that they kill him. In the second part, the emphasis is on the rising of the Son of Man who has been killed. There is strong contrast between the two parts. The first summarizes the events of the passion up to Jesus' death in the brief statement, "the Son of Man is handed over into the hands of men." The passive παραδίδοται is ambiguous. It is a theological passive, characterizing the handing over as a handing over by God.[1] But anyone who knew the passion events would also think of the human agent of the handing over. Behind the passive stands God's will. This was expressed in the first prediction by δεῖ. But also behind the passive is the treachery of Judas. Neither God nor Judas is mentioned explicitly, leaving the saying purposely ambiguous.[2] The phrase "to hand over into the hands of someone" is Semitic. It need not, however, point to an Aramaic origin of the saying as the phrase is common in the Septuagint and would have been familiar to Mark from this source.[3] In this first part of the saying there is a

---

[1]Hahn, p. 39. [2]Hoffmann, "Mk 8,31," p. 187.

[3]Deut 1:27; Jer 33:24; Jdt 6:10; 1 Mac 4:30; Dan 7:25; 11:11; Sir 11:6. See Schenke, Studien, p. 254, n. 2.

play on words in "Son of Man" and "men." This need not point to a Semitic original as it is present in Greek also.[1] We have seen before that Mark tends to use the terms together.[2] Here the "men" are hostile. In the first part of the saying the Son of Man is the passive subject of the handing over. The second part strongly contrasts with this as the Son of Man is the agent of the resurrection. The tendency of ἀνίστημι to emphasize the power of the Son of Man is reinforced by the contrast between the two parts of the saying.

This second prediction is also redactional. The expressions ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀποκτείνω, μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας, and ἀνίστημι are all drawn from the first prediction. The most striking difference between the first two passion predictions is that the first two predicates of the first prediction have been replaced with the brief expression παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων. The verb παραδίδωμι is used in the pre-Markan tradition for the betrayal of Judas.[3] However, Mark can also use the word redactionally for Judas' betrayal.[4] The theological usage of the verb is Markan.[5] The juxtaposition of "Son of Man" and "men" is also Markan. Everything points to a Markan formulation of the saying. This second passion saying with its use of the future tense emphasizes the predictive nature of the three sayings and prepares for the detailed formulation of the third saying.

---

[1]Strecker, "Predictions," p. 434.

[2]See above, pp. 145-46. [3]3:19; 14:42, 44.

[4]14:10, 11, 18. [5]1:14; 9:31; 10:33; 14:41.

The third saying is emphatically predictive. The verbs are all in the future tense, and there is a detailed listing of the events of the passion. This prediction also is Markan redaction. As in the first two sayings we have the combination of the expressions ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀποκτείνω, μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας, and ἀνίστημι. As in the second we have the theological passive of παραδίδωμι. There is, though, as in 9:31, a certain lack of clarity. Although God is the ultimate subject of Jesus' handing over, the usage of the word to describe Judas' betrayal makes this saying also ambiguous. The Son of Man will be handed over to the chief priests and the scribes and they will condemn him to death. There is here a clear reference to the Sanhedrin trial. Mark has lifted the condemnation expression from 14:64. Then with a second use of παραδίδωμι, this time with the high priests and scribes as subject, Mark introduces a second act of the passion, the handing over of Jesus to the gentiles (compare 15:1, 10). The events of the passion that follow all result from this handing over.[1] The details are drawn from Mark's passion narrative. The differences between this prediction and the passion narrative are not significant. The words μαστιγόω and φραγελλόω have the same meaning. The difference in the order of "mocking," "spitting upon," and "flogging" is intended to provide a climax in the prediction that would not be present if the order of events of the passion narrative were followed.[2] As in 8:31 the main responsibility

---

[1]Hoffmann, "Mk 8,31," p. 187.

[2]Ibid., pp. 187-88, n. 65.

lies with the Jewish authorities. They condemn him, and they hand him over to the gentiles for the carrying out of the sentence. This is also in conformity with Mark's passion narrative where the condemnation of Jesus comes in the Sanhedrin trial.

The three passion predictions are linked together geographically and associated with Jesus' way. The first occurs at Caesarea Philippi, the second as Jesus is traveling through Galilee, and the third on the way up to Jerusalem.[1]

At the conclusion of the pericope of the request of James and John, Mark adds: "For the Son of Man also did not come to be served, but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many" (10:45). The saying is not an original unit, but it has been secondarily expanded. The first part of the saying, "For the Son of Man also did not come to be served but to serve," is similar to three sayings in the synoptic tradition:

οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς. (Mark 2:17)

οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι. (Matt 5:17)

οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἀλλὰ μάχαιρον. (Matt 10:34)

The similarities of the four sayings are striking. All four use the aorist of ἔρχομαι, the infinitive, and οὐκ...ἀλλά. One difference is that 10:45a is a Son of Man saying. The parallels, though, suggest that it also was originally an ἦλθον saying that has secondarily been made into a Son of Man

---

[1]Tödt, p. 145; Kelber, p. 69.

saying. The Markan parallel saying in 2:17 is particularly instructive because like 10:45a it concludes a pericope with a saying of Jesus about his mission. In each case the saying resolves the preceding discussion. Here the entire ministry of Jesus is characterized as service, and this is extended in v. 45b to his death. In all probability v. 45b is not the fragment of an originally independent saying; it is rather a gloss that was added to the original saying in v. 45a.[1] The background of the ransom idea that is expressed in the gloss is disputed. Isa 53 is mentioned in this regard,[2] but there are problems with this derivation. The vocabulary of v. 45 does not reflect the vocabulary of Isa 53. The key word is λύτρον. The claim is made that λύτρον renders the word 'ăšām which is found in Isa 53:10.[3] In the Septuagint, however, 'ăšām is never translated by λύτρον. The word λύτρον is used to render the roots g'l, kpr, pdh, and the word $m^{e}ḥir$. This reflects a real difference in meaning of the two words. The basic idea of the root 'šm is guilt.[4] The basic notion

---

[1]Norman Perrin, "The Use of (παρα)διδόναι in Connection with the Passion of Jesus in the New Testament," Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde, ed. Eduard Lohse with Christoph Burchard and Berndt Schaller (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), p. 211; Karl Kertelge, "Der dienende Menschensohn (Mk 10,45)," Jesus und der Menschensohn: Für Anton Vögtle, ed. Rudolf Pesch and Rudolf Schnackenburg with Odilo Kaiser (Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1975), pp. 232-33.

[2]Kertelge, "Der dienende Menschensohn," pp. 231-32; Eduardo Arens, The ΗΛΘΟΝ-Sayings in the Synoptic Tradition, Orbis biblicus et orientalis, vol. 10 (Fribourg: Universitätsverlag, 1976), pp. 135-41.

[3]Kertelge, "Der dienende Menschensohn," pp. 231-32.

[4]Lev 5:14-26.

of λύτρον is equivalence.[1] This is shown by Josephus (Ant. 14, 107) in his account of the efforts of Eleazar to bribe Crassus: τὴν δοκὸν αὐτῷ τὴν χρυσῆν λύτρον ἀντὶ πάντων ἔδωκεν. The gold bar was to take the place of everything else. This same usage is found in the Septuagint.[2] In all instances the root idea is equivalence or substitution. The closest parallel to the ransom concept is the belief in the atoning death of the matyrs that we find in the Maccabean period.[3]

Mark took over the ransom saying from the tradition. The question is whether he has redactionally altered the traditional saying. It is probable that Mark has introduced the Son of Man concept into the saying.[4] The saying was originally an ἦλθον saying. In general, the sayings that have the form "the Son of Man came..." were originally "I came..." sayings.[5] The ransom saying was transformed into a Son of

---

[1]C. K. Barrett, "The Background of Mark 10:45," New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester: Manchester University, 1959), p. 6.

[2]Exod 21:30; 30:12.

[3]Morna D. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament (London: SPCK, 1959), p. 78; Barrett, "Background," p. 12.

[4]Borsch has studied the rival parallel sayings that are preserved in both a Son of Man form and a form that does not contain the title. He has shown against Jeremias that the Son of Man form is generally speaking the earlier form. We would agree that Luke 22:27d is secondary to Mark 10:45. However, the formal parallels found in Mark 2:17, Matt 5:17, and Matt 10:34 show that 10:45a was originally an ἦλθον saying. On the rival parallel sayings, see Joachim Jeremias, "Die älteste Schicht der Menschensohn-Logien," ZNW 58 (1967): 159-172; Borsch, The Christian and Gnostic Son of Man, pp. 1-28.

[5]Arens, pp. 249-50.

Man saying by someone. The question is who? Although this transformation is often assigned to the pre-Markan tradition,[1] the most likely candidate is Mark himself. We must take seriously the fact that we have no evidence independent of the gospel of Mark for the Son of Man passion tradition. This tradition is unknown to Q. It is also unknown to the pre-Markan passion narrative. As we shall see 14:21 and 14:41 are redactional sayings. The passion narrative is moreover dominated by the themes of the suffering just one and the crucified Christ.[2] It is most probable that Mark created the Son of Man passion tradition. The ransom saying forms the climax of the discipleship section of Mark's gospel that began at Caesarea Philippi. It leads directly to the Jerusalem section and the passion in which the Son of Man will give his life as a ransom for many.

The Parousia of the Son of Man

The climax of the eschatological discourse is the coming of the Son of Man: "And then they will see the Son of Man coming in the clouds with great power and glory" (13:26). The verse is close to the Theodotion version of Dan 7:13: καὶ ἰδοὺ μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος. One difference is that Mark has ἐν νεφέλαις instead of Theodotion's μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν. The preposition μετά can be replaced by ἐν on stylistic grounds in Mark.

---

[1] Schenke, Studien, pp. 247-48; Arens, pp. 124-25.

[2] See above, pp. 97-98.

in 8:38 Mark writes ἐν τῇ δόξῃ and in 9:1 ἐν δυνάμει while in 13:26 he writes μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης. In 8:38 he reserves μετά for the angels. Here Mark wants to use μετά with the more important phrase "great power and glory" so he substitutes ἐν before "clouds."[1] More important than this change is the addition "with great power and glory." As in 8:38 Mark adds this description to portray the eschatological nature of the Son of Man.[2] In Q this is unnecessary. The mere name "Son of Man" is sufficient to call to mind the eschatological nature of the figure.[3] In Mark the title alone is not sufficient to do this. This is a further confirmation of our understanding of Mark's Son of Man concept. The Son of Man title hides Jesus' divine dignity in his human condition. To express the dignity additional qualifiers are necessary.

Mark introduces the Daniel quotation with the words, "And then they will see..." (13:26a). In 14:62 the members of the Sanhedrin are threatened with seeing the Son of Man coming. There he is coming in judgment. It is possible

---

[1]The explanation is to be found in Mark's Greek and not in translation from Aramaic as maintained by Scott. See R. B. Y. Scott, "Behold, He Cometh with Clouds," NTS 5 (1958-59): 127-32; Lambrecht, Redaktion, pp. 182-83.

[2]The addition may reflect Dan 7:14 (Tödt, p. 34). What concerns us is the function of the addition in Mark's Son of Man concept.

[3]Luke 11:30//Matt 12:40; Luke 12:8-9//Matt 10:32-33; Luke 12:10//Matt 12:32; Luke 12:40//Matt 24:44; Luke 17:24//Matt 24:27; Luke 17:26//Matt 24:37. See Hoffmann, "Mk 8,31," pp. 198-99.

that the "seeing" here also refers to the judgment.[1] However, the continuation of the depiction of the parousia is extraordinarily positive.[2] The Son of Man sends out the angels to gather the elect. It may be that ὄψονται has just the opposite function of the ὄψεσθε in 14:62. There the members of the Sanhedrin are threatened; here the members of the hard-pressed and scattered community (vv. 14-20) are promised that they will see their salvation.

This vision of the coming of the Son of Man is redactional. The strong verbal contacts with 8:38; 9:1; and 14:62 show that it is Mark who is composing here. At the heart of his parenetic discourse on the end-time Mark places the image of the Son of Man coming to save his elect.

The Passion

At the conclusion of a discussion about Jesus' betrayer (14:17-20), Mark adds a woe saying, "The Son of Man goes as is written about him, but woe to that man through whom the Son of Man is handed over; it were better for him if that man had not been born" (14:21). The saying is a Markan redaction of a woe saying from Q (Luke 17:1-2//Matt 18:6-7) that is best preserved in Luke. A comparison with the Lukan form shows the extent of Mark's redaction:

Luke 17:1-2	Mark 14:21
ἀνένδεκτον ἐστιν τοῦ τὰ σκάνδαλα μὴ ἐλθεῖν	ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει, καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ,

[1] Pesch, Naherwartungen, pp. 167-70.

[2] Tödt, p. 34; Lambrecht, Redaktion, pp. 185, 191.

οὐαὶ δὲ δι' οὗ ἔρχεται:	οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται
λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ εἰ λίθος μυλικὸς περίκειται...	καλὸν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος.[1]

The fact that Mark has preserved the ending of the Q logion in 9:42 is further substantiation that he knew the entire saying. In Q the woe was directed to the one through whom scandals come. In Mark the woe is directed against that man through whom the Son of Man is handed over. The use of ἐκεῖνος is not an echo of Old Testament usage nor a sign that the saying is old;[2] it is a Markan stylistic feature. Mark uses ἐκεῖνος to refer back to the discussion in vv. 17-20.[3] The repetition of ἄνθρωπος is also Markan.[4] The woe is pronounced against that man through whom the Son of Man is handed over. The handing over of the Son of Man which was first mentioned in 9:31 here finds its human subject. There the passive formulation pointed to a handing over by God. A human agent was not excluded, however, and probably also intended. The human agent was drawn more into the foreground with the mention of the historical enemies of Jesus in 10:33, but even there the human agent was not mentioned explicitly. In 14:21 this line of development in the handing over sayings reaches a climax. The Son of Man is handed over by "that man" who is one of the twelve (v. 20) and who shares table

---

[1]Wendling, pp. 168-69. [2]Schenke, Studien, p. 264.

[3]Compare 2:20; 3:24, 25. See Wendling, pp. 25, 169.

[4]Compare 7:14-15. See Wendling, p. 169.

fellowship with the Son of Man (v. 18).[1] "That man" is fully responsible for his action, and it were better for him if he had not been born. Mark replaces the rather involved image of the Q saying (which he uses in 9:42) with an image of not having been born.[2] He also replaces the hapax legomenon λυσιτελεῖ with καλόν (ἐστίν) which was familiar to him from a pre-Markan tradition.[3] In place of the Q saying's first clause on the inevitability of scandals, Mark has formulated a clause that emphasizes both the scriptural necessity of the passion and the free acceptance of the passion by the Son of Man. The verb ὑπάγει corresponds to the many references to Jesus' going on his way.[4] Especially close is the use of προάγω in 10:32. There Jesus goes ahead freely to Jerusalem in contrast to the disciples who follow in fear and unbelief.[5] The scriptural necessity of the passion is brought out explicitly in the phrase "as is written about him." There is a scripture allusion in the immediate context (v. 18, compare Ps 41:9).[6] The theme of the scriptural necessity of the passion was announced at the beginning of the passion predictions in 8:31

---

[1]Hoffmann, "Mk 8,31," p. 191.

[2]Compare Jer 20:14-18; Job 3:1-26; 1 Enoch 38:2. See further Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, vol. 1 (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1926), pp. 775, 989-90.

[3]Compare 9:43, 45, 47.

[4]Compare ὁδός: 8:27; 9:33, 34; 10:17, 32, 46, 52; 11:8; προάγω: 10:32; 14:28; 16:7. See Hoffmann, "Mk 8,31," p. 190.

[5]See above, pp. 62-63.

[6]Hoffmann, "Mk 8,31," pp. 188-89.

(δεῖ) and 9:12 (πῶς γέγραπται...). Mark has welded the statement about the scriptural necessity of the passion and the free acceptance of the Son of Man to the woe pronounced against "that man" both with the μέν...δέ construction and with the repetition of "Son of Man" and "that man." The contrast between "Son of Man" and "that man" is a feature of Mark's understanding of the Son of Man.[1] "That man" is set over against the Son of Man. The expression "that man" means man who thinks the thoughts of men and not of God, man who is not prepared to believe.[2] That the prototype of "that man" is one of the twelve is a further indication that in Mark the response of the disciples to Jesus is basically unbelief. In this saying Mark holds together the will of God as expressed in the scripture, Jesus' free acceptance of this will, and the guilt of man in not believing. The will of God impressively announced in 8:31 is radically rejected by men. The disciples with their flight (14:50) and Peter with his denial (14:54, 66-72) are further examples of men rejecting God's will.[3] Opposition to the Son of Man is disastrous for those who oppose him. The threat implied in 14:21 is present also in 8:38 and 14:62.

At the conclusion of the Gethsemane pericope (14:32-42) there are two short sentences, both introduced by ἰδού and both pointing forward toward the events of the passion. The

---

[1]Compare 2:27-28; 8:27-33; 9:31; and Mark's redaction of the blasphemy saying in 3:28-29.

[2]Compare 8:33. See Hoffmann, "Mk 8,31," p. 186.

[3]Hoffmann, "Mk 8, 31," p. 191.

second sentence, v. 42, points more directly to the immediately following approach of the betrayer and the arrest. Both sentences contain παραδίδωμι, although with different nuances. In v. 41b we have the theological usage whereas v. 42 uses the verb in the profane sense. The first sentence reflects theologically on the approaching passion while the second announces the coming of Judas. The first is a Markan redactional addition to the Gethsemane pericopé.[1] Mark reaches back to 14:17-21; 10:33-34; and especially to 9:31.[2] The enemies of Jesus are characterized as "sinners." The line that has run through Mark's gospel of the murderous opposition to Jesus is coming to its end.[3] This is the last reference to the handing over of the Son of Man. From the beginning of the development of this theme in 9:31 to this passage at the beginning of the final events of the passion, Mark has brought out two aspects: The passion is God's will, and the enemies of Jesus and the disciples remain in unbelief.

The Trial

In the trial before the Sanhedrin Jesus answers "I am" to the high priest's question, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed One?" Jesus goes on to say, "And you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Power and coming with the clouds" (14:62b). This saying is an announcement

---

[1]Schenke, Studien, pp. 465-71.

[2]Hoffmann, "Mk 8,31," p. 191.

[3]Compare especially 2:7; 3:6, 22-30; 8:11-13; 11:18; 12:12; 14:1-2, 10-11.

of Jesus' vindication.[1] It is also a threat that has special meaning because of the context. The members of the Sanhedrin who are sitting in judgment on Jesus will themselves be the subjects of an even more terrible judgment when the one they are judging returns as the end-time judge, the Son of Man. This is the force of the verb ὄψεσθε. It is completely determined by the context and is not a reflection of Zech 12:10.[2] The Son of Man is the object of the seeing, and on this object depend the two participles καθήμενον and ἐρχόμενον. It is difficult to imagine the Son of Man seated and coming. The two participles do not describe two acts or two parts of one act. The first describes a state of enthronement and the second describes the act of coming in judgment.[3] The threat is contained in the statement that the Son of Man will come in judgment, but this presupposes the enthronement. As in the other two parousia sayings in Mark, the title "Son of Man" is not sufficient to call to mind the eschatological dignity of the end-time judge. The enthronement statement is needed as a precondition of the description of the Son of Man's coming in judgment. The contrast between Jesus, the Son of Man who has now been handed over into the hands of men, and the coming

---

[1]David M. Hay, pp. 127-28.

[2]Gnilka, "Verhandlungen," pp. 15-16. Perrin sees a reference to Zech 12:10. See Norman Perrin, "Mark xiv.62: The End Product of a Christian Pesher Tradition?," NTS 12 (1965-66): 150-55.

[3]Schenke, Der gekreuzigte Christus, p. 40. The coming is a coming in judgment, not a coming to God. The order of the participles is decisive on this point. See H. K. McArthur, "Mark xiv.62," NTS 4 (1957-58): 156-58.

Son of Man could hardly be greater. The thought is that Jesus' judges will see the Son of Man who now stands before them exalted to God's right hand and as the exalted Son of Man coming in judgment. The two participial phrases are reflections of Ps 110:1 and Dan 7:13. The combination of two scripture references is typical of Mark's use of scripture.[1] According to Suhl the references are just free formulations.[2] However, the second participial phrase is close to Theodotion's translation of Dan 7:13. The differences are due to Mark's sentence structure in which the Son of Man is the object of "you will see" and not the subject of the sentence. The first scripture reference has been assimilated to the second. Mark has used both scripture passages before (compare 12:36 and 13:26), and it is probably Mark who has combined them here. There are several indications that it is Mark who is at work here. First, we have seen that the trial scene originally centered only on the title "Christ."[3] Mark added the interpretative phrase "Son of the Blessed One."[4] In 14:62b the phrase τῆς δυνάμεως corresponds to τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ in 14:61. Both are circumlocutions for God. We have seen that the expression "the Blessed One" is very rare as a circumlocution.

---

[1]Howard Clark Kee, "The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16," Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70.Geburtstag, ed. E. Earle Ellis and Erich Grässer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), pp. 175-77.

[2]Alfred Suhl, Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965), p. 54.

[3]See above, pp. 94-97. [4]See above, pp. 131-32.

for God. "The Power" is also an unusual circumlocution. The phrase is found only here and in the Matthean parallel in the entire New Testament. The rabbinic parallels,[1] besides being late, show a regular usage only for the phrase "from the mouth of the Power."[2] We have another example of Mark's attempt to use Jewish terminology.[3] As on other occasions, he only imprecisely succeeds. The concept of the Son of Man in v. 62 fits perfectly into the understanding of the title that we have seen to be Mark's. Of itself the title is not able to call up the eschatological dignity of the end-time judge. It needs a further qualification, here the Psalm quotation, to point to the end-time function of the Son of Man. A final indication that v. 62 comes from Mark is the use of the double participle.[4]

The original trial scene mentioned only the Christ predicate. Mark has added "the Son of the Blessed One" and "You will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Power and coming with the clouds of heaven." Again we have evidence of Mark's coordination of the three main Christological titles.

Conclusions

Of the fourteen occurrences of "Son of Man" in Mark only 2:10 and 2:28 can with any certainty be assigned to the pre-Markan tradition. The saying in 8:38 is a Markan redaction of a Q saying; 10:45 was probably a traditional ἦλθον saying

---

[1]Strack-Billerbeck, vol. 1, pp. 1006-1007.

[2]Lohmeyer, p. 328. [3]Horstmann, p. 20.

[4]Neirynck, pp. 82-84.

that Mark made into a Son of Man saying; 14:21 is a free Markan adaptation of a Q woe saying. The rest are all redactional. In particular the Son of Man passion sayings are redactional. In all probability Mark is the creator of the Son of Man passion tradition.

The Son of Man appears only in sayings of Jesus. Jesus uses the title as a self-designation, often where we would expect a simple "I." The Son of Man title conceals the dignity of Jesus in his human condition. Jesus' authority is the authority of God himself (2:10, 28), but it is contested and has to be demonstrated. It is not evident. The Son of Man is a mysterious figure. It is for this reason that the title is never followed by a command to silence, unlike the titles "Christ" and "Son of God" which are always followed by a command to silence when they are spoken in public before the trial before the Sanhedrin.

Jesus is the coming Son of Man in Mark. He will come to judge, and he will come to rescue the elect. The title itself, though, it not adequate to call up the eschatological glory. For this, further imagery is necessary.

Primarily, though, the Son of Man is the suffering Son of Man, Jesus who is handed over by God and his disciple into the hands of sinners who kill him. The Son of Man suffers according to God's will as expressed in the scriptures, but his enemies are not absolved of guilt. It were better for the one who hands him over that he had not been born, and those who condemn him will see him coming as their judge. Even in the passion sayings, however, the dignity of the Son of Man

is not forgotten. After he is killed he will rise.

We turn now to consider the two confessional scenes of Mark. In the Casearea Philippi pericope Peter confesses that Jesus is the Christ. In the trial before the Sanhedrin Jesus himself accepts the two titles "Christ" and "Son of God," and for his self-confession he is condemned to death.

CHAPTER V

CONFESSION AND TRIAL

The messianic secret is a major Markan Christological theme. The content of the secret is the question, "Who is Jesus?" In his use of the titles "Christ," "Son of God," and "Son of Man" Mark expresses important aspects of his understanding of who Jesus is. There are two passages, however, that center explicitly on the question of Jesus' identity. We will now examine in detail the Caesarea Philippi pericope (8:27-9:1) and the trial before the Sanhedrin (14:55-65).

Peter's Confession

The Caesarea Philippi episode is a larger literary unit made up of three sections: 8:27-30; 8:31-33; and 8:34-9:1. The introductory phrases of the second and third parts, καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν (8:31) and καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ (8:34), clearly mark new beginnings within the larger literary unity.[1] We have examined the second section and found it to be completely redactional.[2] We even found indications that the Satan saying (v. 33b) is a Markan formulation. We turn now to the first section.

The first section (8:27-30) consists of a brief

---

[1]Pesch, "Messiasbekenntnis," pp. 179-85.

[2]See above, pp. 50-55, 147-52.

introduction (v. 27a), two similarly formulated questions of Jesus to the disciples (vv. 27b, 29a), the answers of the disciples (v. 28) and Peter (v. 29b), and Jesus' command to silence (v. 30). We have already seen that the command to silence is redactional.[1] This is already an indication that this first section is not a traditional unit, for without v. 30 there is no conclusion to the dialogue. It is not conceivable that a traditional pericope would have Jesus take the initiative as he does in v. 27b, press his question when the first answer was not satisfactory, and then not have him react to Peter's statement. We have seen that the traditional reaction to Peter's confession is not to be found in v. 33.[2] Bultmann tries to find the original reaction in Matt 16:17-19;[3] but this is unfounded.[4] It is possible that the original reaction of Jesus has been broken off by Mark and replaced by his command to silence. However, the fact that Mark has formulated completely vv. 30-33 should make us wary of postulating too easily a traditional pericope in vv. 27-29, and the fact that we do not have a completely rounded pericope in vv. 27-29 that is capable of independent existence in the pre-Markan tradition should make us even

---

[1]See above, p. 50. Lohmeyer (p. 165) links the command with the first passion prediction. This is impossible because the phrase "And he began to teach" marks a new beginning.

[2]See above, pp. 51-52.

[3]Bultmann, History, p. 258.

[4]Anton Vögtle, "Messiasbekenntnis und Petrusverheissung: Zur Komposition Mt 16,13-23 Par.," BZ 1 (1957): 252-72; 2 (1958): 85-103.

more cautious.

The opinions of "men" expressed in 8:28 are also found in 6:14-15:

6:14-15	8:28
καὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν, ...ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἠλίας ἐστιν· ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι προφήτης ὡς εἷς τῶν προφητῶν.	οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες ὅτι Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστήν καὶ ἄλλοι Ἠλίαν ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι εἷς τῶν προφητῶν.

There is clearly a literary relationship between the passages; the same three opinions are mentioned in both passages in the same order.[1] Minette de Tillesse and Denaux maintain that 8:28 is dependent on 6:14-15.[2] It is evident that 6:14-15 is a fuller text. John the Baptist is described as "raised from the dead" and the third opinion is given in the longer form "a prophet like one of the prophets." The opinions in v. 28 do appear to presuppose the fuller formulation in 6:14-15. However, this does not mean that 6:14-15 is a traditional introduction to the account of the death of the Baptist. It is fitted secondarily into the context of 6:14-29.[3] It can also be questioned whether we have any pre-Markan tradition in 6:14-15 and 8:28. The key to understanding the two texts is the mention of John the Baptist. John is mentioned first. This appears natural in the light of the use made of the text in 6:14-16 to introduce the death of John. However, it is not

---

[1]Pesch maintains that there is no literary dependence of one passage on the other, but this is impossible. See Pesch, "Messiasbekenntnis," p. 190.

[2]Minette de Tillesse, pp. 310-12; Denaux, pp. 198-99.

[3]See above, p. 31.

just the context of 6:14-29 alone that focuses attention on John. The second and third opinions are really spun out of the first. Mark consistently identifies John with Elijah. This is evident from 1:2 where Mark applies a classic Elijah text Mal 3:1 to John and from 9:11-13. Mark also characterizes John as a prophet (11:32). There is furthermore a tendency in Mark to parallel John's life and death and Jesus'. John comes preaching (κηρύσσων, 1:4); Jesus comes preaching (κηρύσσων, 1:14).[1] Both preach repentence (1:4, 15). John and Jesus are both described as prophets (11:32; 6:4).[2] The source of Jesus' authority is the same as the source of John's (11:27-33). John's arrest is described with the same highly nuanced word παραδίδωμι (1:14) as Jesus' arrest.[3] Jesus is identified with John by Herod (6:14-16), and the murderer of John is also listed as an enemy of Jesus (8:15, compare 3:6; 12:13). John's death, like that of Jesus, is according to the scriptures (9:11-13). In line with this paralleling of John and Jesus, John is described in 6:14 as raised from the dead.[4] The statement in 6:14-16 and 8:28 identifying John and

---

[1]Schweizer, "Anmerkungen," pp. 93-94.

[2]Compare also 1:2-8 for John and 9:7 for Jesus. John is identified with Elijah and Jesus with the eschatological prophet of Deut 18:15.

[3]Compare 3:19; 9:31; 14:10, 11, 18, 21, 41, 42, 44; 15:1, 10, 15.

[4]Pesch claims the statement reflects a tradition about the death and resurrection of the eschatological prophet. See Rudolf Pesch, "Zur Entstehung des Glaubens an die Auferstehung Jesu," TQ 153 (1973): 222-23; further, Klaus Berger, Die Auferstehung des Propheten und die Erhöhung des Menschensohnes: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Deutung des Geschickes

Jesus is the final working out of the large scale parallelizing of John and Jesus in Mark. It is thus redactional. The other two opinions about Jesus flow from the first one. They are simply further explicitations of the first identification of Jesus with John. Mark uses the threefold identification twice. He introduces the opinions in 6:14-16 in their full form to lead up to the account of John's death. Then he refers back to them in a briefer form in 8:28. The verse 8:28 is thus redactional.

If v. 28 is redactional, then the whole double question scheme in vv. 27b-29 must be redactional. The point of the dialogue is to contrast the opinions of men and the opinion of the disciples. The opinion of the disciples surpasses and corrects the opinions of men. Without v. 28 and its introductory question v. 27b, the remaining pericope (vv. 27a and 29) could not exist. The question in v. 29 would be completely unmotivated. In the present form of the pericope the question directed to the disciples is motivated by the prior question about the opinions of men. Jesus is steering the disciples toward the correct confession. In other words, if v. 28 is redactional, then v. 29 is also.

The place name Caesarea Philippi is often held to point

Jesu in frühchristlichen Texten, Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, vol. 13 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976). However, the sources do not provide clear evidence of a pre-Christian tradition of the death and resurrection of the eschatological prophet. See Martin Hengel, "Ist der Osterglauben noch zu retten?," TQ 153 (1973): 257-62; Richard Bauckham, "The Martyrdom of Enoch and Elijah: Jewish or Christian?," JBL 95 (1976): 447-58; Johannes M. Nützel, "Zum Schicksal der eschatologischen Propheten," BZ 20 (1976): 59-94.

to a traditional origin of the pericope. Caesarea Philippi is mentioned only here and in the parallel in Matthew in the gospel tradition. It is not a necessary station on a Markan itinerary. Nor does there seem to be any theological reason for its mention here. Furthermore, Mark does not introduce place names into his narrative. He may pick up a place name from the tradition and develop it further, but he does not introduce a new place name.[1] For example, Mark may well have introduced a general, theologically important place name like Galilee in 9:30, but it is unthinkable that he would introduce a specific, theologically irrelevant name like Caesarea Philippi in 8:27.

How good are these arguments? First, it is simply not true that Mark avoids introducing new place names into his narrative. In all probability the summary in 3:7-12 is completely redactional.[2] There we have the place name "Idumea" which is a hapax legomenon in the New Testament. Mark has probably introduced it to show that the crowds that stream to Jesus come from beyond Jewish territory. Furthermore, the place name Caesarea Philippi, while not absolutely demanded by a strict itinerary, does fit well into the geographical framework of Mark. From 1:38 Jesus has been on the move in Mark. His movements are not always easy to follow, but in general they center around the Sea of Galilee with forays

---

[1]Schmidt, Rahmen, p. 216; Horstmann, pp. 9-10.

[2]See above, p. 17, n. 2.

into the Decapolis (5:1; 7:31) and to the north (7:24).[1] The trip to the north is significant because it is motivated by a desire of Jesus to be hidden (7:24). The same motive is probably at work here. Jesus has just been in Bethsaida (8:22). He wants to question his disciples about who he is, thus beginning the period of intense instruction of the disciples (8:27-10:52).[2] For this he needs privacy, so again he moves north. The form of the place name is unusual. We are not told that Jesus went to Caesarea Philippi, but to the villages of Caesarea Philippi. The word κώμη is a Markan word. He uses it as a link-word in the section 6:6b-8:26.[3] In particular, Mark uses it in two redactional summaries 6:6b and 6:53-56.[4] Far from being a sign of pre-Markan tradition, the place name points to Markan redaction!

Once the question of the place name has been settled, there are no further obstacles to understanding 8:27-30 as completely redactional. The verb ἐξέρχομαι is Markan;[5] and

---

[1]The Sea of Galilee is mentioned in 2:1; 3:7; 4:1; 5:21; 6:32, 45, 53; 7:31; 8:10, 13, 22. What causes particular difficulty is that it is not always clear where Jesus is with the multiple crossings of the sea. For attempts to unravel the puzzle, see Kelber, pp. 45-65; Snoy, "Rédaction," pp. 205-41.

[2]On this section besides Reploh see Konrad Weiss, "Ekklesiologie, Tradition und Geschichte in der Jüngerunterweisung Mark 8,27-10,52," Der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus, ed. Helmut Ristow and Karl Matthiae, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961), pp. 414-38.

[3]Egger, Frohbotschaft, p. 154.

[4]Egger, Frohbotschaft, pp. 153-55; Snoy, "Miracles," 4 (1973): 96-98.

[5]See above, p. 23, n. 4.

it is especially prominent in pericope introductions.[1] The alternation of the singular followed by the mention of the disciples,[2] the repetition of "disciples,"[3] the double use of ἐπερωτάω and its combination with ἀποκρίνομαι[4] are Markan. The phrase ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ is also redactional.[5] We have seen that Peter is the spokesman for the group of the disciples in the Caesarea Philippi episode.[6] This is consistent with the picture of Peter in Mark. Mark portrays him as the spokesman for the group in other passages.[7] All indications point to the conclusion that Mark composed the entire section 8:27-30 himself.

Mark's composition is impressive. He has Jesus and the disciples withdraw to Caesarea Philippi for privacy. On the way he asks them who men say he is. Jesus' way will end on the cross in Jerusalem (15:41). It begins here with the question who he is. The disciples answer with the threefold opinion that unfolds the theme of the paralleling of John and

---

[1] 1:29, 35; 2:13; 6:1; 7:31; 9:30; 11:12; 14:26. See Pesch, "Messiasbekenntnis," 17 (1973): 180.

[2] Turner, "Usage," 26 (1924-25): 231-33.

[3] Neirynck, pp. 85-87.

[4] See above, p. 35, n. 1. See Neirynck, pp. 77-81, 130-31.

[5] See above, p. 63, n. 3.

[6] See above, pp. 52-53.

[7] 9:5; 10:28; 11:21; 14:29 (compare 14:31). See Nikolaus Walter, "Zur Analyse von Mc 10:17-31," ZNW 53 (1962): 214-15; Heinz Giesen, "Der verdorrte Feigenbaum--Eine symbolische Aussage? Zu Mk 11,12-14,20f," BZ 20 (1976): 109.

Jesus. These opinions are not adequate, nor can the disciples merely recount what men say. Jesus addresses them squarely with the question, "But you, who do you say I am?" Peter answers for the group, "You are the Christ." Mark draws this confession from the pre-Markan trial before the Sanhedrin (14:61) thus creating a parallel between Peter's confession and Jesus' self-confession before the Sanhedrin. Mark then adds the command to secrecy. Who Jesus is may not be spoken.

Joined to this section is another Markan composition, 8:31-33. Jesus begins to teach that the Son of Man must suffer, be rejected and killed, and rise after three days. Peter rebukes Jesus, showing once again the complete lack of understanding of the disciples. Jesus strongly rebukes Peter and orders him to get behind him, to become again a disciple.

Mark joins the final section (8:34-9:1) to the preceding with a redactional phrase καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. The presence of the crowd is at first astonishing. Mark mentions the crowd to deliberately broaden the audience to include the later community. The crowd is not in general representative of the later community (compare, though, 3:32-35). However, the rebuke of Peter in the presence of the disciples in v. 33 gives the impression of being an historical scene, and Mark brings in the crowd to broaden the audience beyond the disciples of Jesus' lifetime to include the community of his own day.[1] The sayings on discipleship that follow are for all who follow

[1]Schnackenburg, "Evangelium," pp. 317-18.

Jesus.

The first five sayings are strung together by the repeated use of γάρ. Mark uses γάρ grequently to link sayings together without intending that the γάρ sayings give the reason or ground for the preceding statement. It is simply a link word.[1] The final saying is joined to the first five by another Markan link phrase καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς.

The first saying announces the theme of the section, "If anyone wishes to follow after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me" (8:34).[2] The saying is a Markan redaction of a Q saying.[3] The Matthean version differs somewhat from Luke's:

καὶ ὃς οὐ λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου,
οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος. (Matt 10:38)
ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου,
οὐ δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής (Luke 14:27)

The verb βαστάζω is used fairly frequently by Luke;[4] it probably replaced the original λαμβάνω preserved by Matthew.[5]

---

[1]4:22, 25; 8:35, 36, 37, 38; 9:40, 41, 49; 13:8. See Schnackenburg, "Mk 9,33-50," pp. 196-97.

[2]The Matthean parallel (Matt 16:24) follows Mark closely. Luke substitutes ἔρχεσθαι for ἀκολουθεῖν, ἀρνησάσθω for ἀπαρνησάσθω, and he adds καθ' ἡμέραν to the phrase about taking up one's cross (Luke 9:23). The addition reflects the waning of the near expectation of the end which is characteristic of Luke.

[3]The saying may have circulated independently in the oral tradition. Mark may or may not have known a written Q. All that is necessary to the argument is that he had access to the saying.

[4]Luke 7:14; 10:4; 11:27; 14:27; 22:10; Acts 3:2; 9:15; 15:10, 21:35.

[5]Erich Dinkler, "Jesu Wort vom Kreuztragen," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift

Matthew probably drew the expression "follow after" from Mark 8:34; Luke's "come after" preserves the original Q expression. It is difficult to choose between Matthew's "is not worthy of me" and Luke's "can not be my disciple." Perhaps Luke preserves the original Q expression, and Matthew found it too harsh. We can now tentatively reconstruct the Q saying and compare it with Mark's saying:

> ὅστις οὐ λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου, οὐ δύναται εἶναι μου μαθητής. (Q: Matt 10:38//Luke 14:27)
> εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἀκολουθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι. (8:34)

Mark has completely recast the saying to emphasize his discipleship theme. This theme is of course present in the Q saying, but Mark wants to give it even greater relief. For this reason he draws the statement about "following" to the beginning in a somewhat redundant phrase εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἀκολουθεῖν.[1] He has expanded the phrase about taking up the cross by prefacing it with "let him deny himself," putting both phrases into the imperative. The expression ἀπαρνεῖσθαι ἑαυτόν means "to surrender oneself," "to put one's whole existence at stake."[2] This complete abandonment of oneself is what is meant by taking up one's cross.[3] The first two imperatives are condi-

---

für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, vol. 21, ed. Walther Eltester (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954), pp. 111-12.

[1]The reading ἀκολουθεῖν (P^{45} C^{*} D Θ) is to be preferred to ἐλθεῖν (ℵ A B C^{2} K L) which attempts to avoid the harsh syntax. See Lohmeyer, p. 171, n. 3.

[2]Dinkler, "Jesu Wort," p. 128; Harald Riesenfeld, "The Meaning of the Verb ἀρνεῖσθαι," Coniectanea Neotestamentica 11 (1947): 218.

[3]Donald R. Fletcher, "Condemned to Die: The Logion

tions for the third. When the disciple has abandoned himself and taken up his cross, then he can follow Jesus.[1] With this second use of ἀκολουθέω Mark returns to the beginning of the saying. The condition of discipleship is abandonment and the cross.

This theme is developed in the second saying which is also a Markan redaction of a Q saying (Matt 10:39//Luke 17:33). The version of Luke is closest to the original Q form, and a comparison with the Markan saying shows Mark's redaction.[2]

Luke 17:33	Mark 8:35
ὃς ἐὰν ζητήσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ περιποιήσασθαι, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, καὶ ὃς ἂν ἀπολέσει, ζωογονήσει αὐτήν.	ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσει τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου σώσει αὐτήν.

The most noticeable change is the Markan addition "for the sake of me and the gospel."[3] With the word "gospel" Mark draws the demands into relationship with the community of his own day.[4] The acceptance of the gospel makes the same demands on Mark's community that Jesus makes on the disciples.[5]

---

on Cross-Bearing: What does it Mean?" Interpretation 18 (1964): 161-64.

[1]Klostermann, p. 84.

[2]Bultmann, History, p. 93. Compare also John 12:25.

[3]Luke and Matthew both omit the reference to the gospel in the parallel passages (Luke 9:24; Matt 16:25).

[4]Gerhard Dautzenberg, Sein Leben bewahren: Ψυχή in den Herrenworten der Evangelien, Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, vol. 14 (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1966), p. 61.

[5]Schnackenburg, "Evangelium," pp. 316-17; on the saying see further Johannes B. Bauer, "'Wer sein Leben retten will...':

Mark then adds two questions that pick up the key word ψυχή. They are further linked by the interrogative τί and by ἄνθρωπος. The first question uses the word pair καρδαίνω-ζημιόω to draw out the supreme value of the life the disciple is required to forfeit for Jesus and the gospel.[1] The second uses ἀντάλλαγμα to express the same thought.[2] The two questions may be traditional sayings that Mark has added here because of his theme and the presence of the link word ψυχή, but ad hoc formulation by Mark himself cannot be ruled out.

The four sayings in vv. 34-37 set out the demands of discipleship. The seriousness of the demands of discipleship is brought out by the statement that what is at stake is one's whole existence (v. 35) and the questions (vv. 36-37) show this to be an incalculably precious value. Mark further emphasizes the seriousness of cross bearing by adding the Son of Man saying in v. 38 which he has taken over from Q and redacted.[3] What will be decisive at the judgment is acceptance or non-acceptance of the demands of discipleship. The Markan addition καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους refers back to 8:31 and 8:34. Acceptance

---

Mk 8,35 Parr.," Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70.Geburtstag, ed. J. Blinzler, O. Kuss, F. Mussner (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1963), pp. 7-10.

[1]Compare κερδαίνω-ζημιόω and κέρδος-ζημία in Phil 3:7-11. See Strack-Billerbeck, vol. 1, pp. 749-50; Dautzenberg, pp. 69-71.

[2]Compare 1 Kgs 21:2 LXX; Sir 6:15; 26:14. See Strack-Billerbeck, vol. 1, pp. 750-51.

[3]See above, pp. 153-58.

of Jesus involves acceptance of his way which is the way of the cross both for himself and for his followers.

Only the negative side of the judgment is brought out in v. 38, but the positive aspect is contained in the promise in 9:1, "And he said to them, 'Amen I say to you that some of these here present will not taste death until they see the kingdom of God coming in power.'" The promise is similar in form and content to 13:30:

9:1	13:30
ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι	ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι
εἰσίν τινες	
ὧδε τῶν ἑστηκότων οἵτινες	
οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται θανάτου,	οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη
ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν	μέχρις οὗ
τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ	ταῦτα πάντα
ἐληλυθυῖαν ἐν δυνάμει.	γένηται.

The similarity of construction is striking. Both sentences have ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι followed by οὐ μή with the subjunctive and an "until" clause with the subjunctive.[1] The thought of both is similar. Both state that within a definite time something will happen. The context of both sayings associates them with the coming of the Son of Man. This coming has been announced in 8:38 immediately preceding 9:1 and in 13:26-27 (compare 13:29) immediately before 13:30.[2] Furthermore the vocabulary of 9:1 is Markan. Mark talks about "seeing" the Parousia.[3] In 13:26 the Son of Man comes "with great power

---

[1]Lambrecht, Redaktion, p. 203; Norman Perrin, "The Composition of Mark ix 1," NT 11 (1969): 68.

[2]Lambrecht, Redaktion, p. 203.

[3]9:1; 13:26; 14:62; see Perrin, "Composition," p. 68.

and glory?" In 8:38 the Son of Man comes "in his Father's glory," and in 9:1 the kingdom of God comes "in power." Mark has composed 9:1 as a word of encouragement to balance the negative threat of judgment in 8:38.[1] The reward of discipleship is seeing the kingdom of God coming in power.

The sayings in 8:34-9:1 are the ecclesiological consequences of the Christology that is expressed in 8:27-30 and 8:31. The way of the community is the way of the Son of Man. Just as the Son of Man must suffer many things, be rejected and killed, and then rise after three days; so, too, the disciple must take up his cross and follow after Jesus, forfeiting his own life but in the end seeing the kingdom of God coming in power. The Christology of the section thus determines the ecclesiology.

The Christology of the section as a whole is, however, disputed. According to Horstmann, Weeden, and Perrin, Mark corrects the title "Christ" in Peter's confession with his own Son of Man Christology.[2] The titles "Christ" and "Son of Man" cannot be played off against each other in this way. As we have seen Mark has drawn the title "Christ" in 8:29 from the question of the high priest in 14:61 where it stands as the main interpreting title of the passion. Jesus' ἐγώ εἰμι (14:62) is a full affirmation of the title. It is for this affirmation of the Christ predicate that Jesus is condemned to death by the Sanhedrin. In the form "the King

---

[1]Perrin, "Composition," pp. 69-70.

[2]See above, pp. 88, 99-101.

of the Jews" the title dominates the entire proceedings from the hearing before Pilate to the crucifixion. The "Christ" title is also used for the vindication and exaltation of Jesus (12:35-37). In other words, the content of the title "Christ" is the same as the content of the Son of Man saying in 8:31. There are two reasons for the shift from "Christ" to "Son of Man." The first reason lies in the nature of the two titles. "Christ" is a confessional title; it can be used as a predicate applied to Jesus. "Son of Man" is never used in the gospels as a predicate; it occurs only in sayings of Jesus, most often as a form of self-designation. Peter confesses Jesus as "the Christ." Jesus teaches that he, "the Son of Man," must suffer. The second reason for the shift from "Christ" to "Son of Man" is that Jesus is beginning the intense period of instruction of the disciples. He unfolds for the disciples the Jerusalem events. These events will bring Jesus down to complete ruin. He will be delivered to his enemies, tortured, and killed. Ultimately, he will be vindicated by his resurrection. The "Son of Man" title expresses for Mark Jesus' divine dignity hidden in his humanness. It is eminently suitable for use in this instruction on Jesus' way.

At the center of Mark's gospel stands a question, "But you, who do you say I am?" The question is addressed by Jesus to the disciples and through them to the members of Mark's community and to us the readers of the gospel. Peter answers for the group, "You are the Christ." Jesus responds with the Son of Man saying, coordinating the two titles. Peter and the disciples show themselves completely incapable

of understanding Jesus' teaching. Not to grasp the way of the Son of Man is not to grasp who Jesus is. Failure to grasp who Jesus is is a denial of one's whole existence as a disciple. For this reason Jesus orders Peter to get behind him, to become again a disciple, to follow in the only way that means life, the way of the cross.

The Sanhedrin Trial

The Sanhedrin trial (14:55-65) has a unifying theme that is announced at the beginning, "The chief priests and the whole Sanhedrin sought witness against Jesus to put him to death" (14:55). This witness motif dominates the calling of witnesses that is given broad development. After Jesus' own testimony the high priest states that there is no longer any need for further witnesses; Jesus has become the witness they sought. When they find him guilty and condemn him to death, the narrative returns to its starting point.[1] Despite this basic unity there is some unevenness in the passage. Twice there is mention of false witness against Jesus (vv. 56, 57); twice it is stated that the witness did not agree (vv. 56, 59). Mark has split the two parts of v. 56 and used them as a frame for the temple charge.[2] Furthermore, the temple charge competes with the messianic claim. The charge is introduced and then dropped. It does not figure further in the trial. It has the appearance of being a later insertion into the trial.

---

[1]Gnilka, "Verhandlungen," p. 11.

[2]Gnilka, "Verhandlungen," p. 19; Donahue, pp. 71-84.

The use of the framing technique to introduce the saying points to Mark as the one responsible for the insertion.[1] We have already seen that Mark has added "the Son of the Blessed One" in v. 61 and the Son of Man saying in v. 62b.[2] The mocking scene is also a later addition to the trial. In this scene Jesus is mocked as a prophet.[3] This is only intelligible if there are prophetic elements in the trial narrative. The prophetic elements, though, are all Markan additions (vv. 58, 62b). Mark has added the tradition in v. 65 to the original trial narrative. The pre-Markan trial narrative consisted of vv. 55, 56, 60, 61a, 62a, 63, 64:

55 οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον ἐζήτουν κατὰ τοῦ
Ἰησοῦ μαρτυρίαν εἰς τὸ θανατῶσαι αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ ηὕρισκον·
56 πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐψευδομαρτύρουν κατ' αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἴσαι αἱ μαρτυρίαι οὐκ ἦσαν.
60 καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς μέσον ἐπηρώτησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν
λέγων, οὐκ ἀποκρίνῃ οὐδέν; τί οὗτοί σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν;
61 ὁ δὲ ἐσιώπα καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδέν.
πάλιν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός;
62 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, ἐγώ εἰμι.
63 ὁ δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς διαρρήξας τοὺς χιτῶνας αὐτοῦ λέγει,
τί ἔτι χρείαν ἔχομεν μαρτύρων
64 ἠκούσατε τῆς βλασφημίας· τί ὑμῖν φαίνεται;
οἱ δὲ πάντες κατέκριναν αὐτὸν ἔνοχην εἶναι θανάτου.

The narrative is dominated from beginning to end by the witness theme. The high priests and the Sanhedrin seek witness against Jesus to put him to death (v. 55). The witnesses are characterized as false (v. 56) and their witness is always against Jesus (vv. 56, 60). After Jesus' own testimony the high priest

---

[1]Donahue, p. 83.

[2]See above, pp. 94-97, 131-32, 171-74.

[3]W. C. van Unnik, "Jesu Verhöhnung vor den Synedrium (Mc 14:65 par)," ZNW 29 (1930): 310-11.

asks, "What further need do we have of witnesses?" (v. 63). Jesus has become the witness, and they condemn him to death (v. 64). The scene is through and through dominated by motifs from the psalms of the suffering just man. The silence of Jesus corresponds to passages like Ps 37:14-16 LXX: "I am like a deaf man and do not hear, like a dumb man who does not open his mouth. I am like one who does not hear and have in my mouth no objections. For I hope in you, Lord. You must answer, Lord my God." This same silence is found in Ps 38:9-10 LXX, "You have given me as a reproach to the fool; I was dumb and did not open my mouth." The silence of the righteous is in contrast to the fierce attacks of his enemies: "The mouth of the sinner and the mouth of the deceitful man have been opened against me; they speak against me with a deceitful tongue, they surround me with words of hate" (Ps 108:2-3 LXX). The motif of seeking the just man's death is also paralleled in the psalms: "The sinner despises the just and seeks to put him to death (ζητεῖ τοῦ θανατῶσαι αὐτόν)" (Ps 36:32 LXX).[1] The motif of the deceitful, lying witnesses is also found in the psalms: "Unjust witnesses rose up against me" (Ps 26:12 LXX).[2] One of the major themes of the pre-Markan passion narrative is the theme of Jesus the suffering just man.[3] This theme dominates the witness motif of the trial. The other major theme of the pre-Markan passion

---

[1]Compare Ps 53:5 LXX; Ps 37:13 LXX; Ps 62:10 LXX.

[2]Gnilka, "Verhandlungen," pp. 11-12.

[3]Ruppert, pp. 44-59.

narrative, the theme of the crucified Christ, is present in the climax of the trial. The narrative is dramatically reduced to the two protagonists, and the high priest asks, "Are you the Christ?" (v. 61). Jesus answers, "I am" (v. 62). Jesus is crucified for his confession of himself as the Christ. This theme is then developed in the proceedings before Pilate and reaches another climax in the crucifixion scene where Jesus is executed as "The King of the Jews" (15:26). There is a certain polemical point to having the condemnation come from the Jewish authorities and not from the Romans. More important is the theological point. The scandal of the cross is God's will. Although human agents are not absolved of responsibility for what they do, it is part of the great paradox of the cross that the events are set in motion by the supreme religious authority of the Jewish community.

Mark has redacted the trial by adding the temple saying and its frame (vv. 57-59), by expanding the dialogue in vv. 61-62, and by adding the mocking scene in v. 65. He has also situated the trial in a new immediate context by surrounding it with Peter's denial, and he has created a new macro context by developing the messianic secret so that it leads to the trial where it is disclosed.

As we have seen Mark introduces the temple charge into the trial by splitting the two parts of v. 56 and using them to frame the insertion. The charge is the statement that Jesus prophesied the destruction of the temple and the building of another: "We have heard him say, 'I will destroy this temple

made by hands and within three days I will build another not made by hands'" (v. 58).[1] The saying contrasts "this temple made by hands" with "another not made by hands." "This temple" is the Jerusalem temple. The other temple not made by hands can only be the Christian community.[2] The term χειροποίητης has a negative connotation.[3] The temple made by hands will be destroyed. The corresponding term ἀχειροποίητος is found only in the New Testament. It implies something of a whole new order.[4] The phrase "within three days" in the context can only refer to the resurrection.[5] The expression in v. 59, "And even then their testimony did not agree," has been taken to mean that Mark considered the temple saying a false charge brought against Jesus. However, there can be no doubt that the temple saying is true at least on one level for Mark. The remark in v. 59 may be no more than a simple setting aside of the temple charge to make room for the high priest's

---

[1]Forms of the temple saying appear in various contexts in the New Testament. Matthew, like Mark, has the saying in the trial scene (Matt 26:61). Mark and Matthew refer back to the saying in the mocking scene (Mark 15:29; Matt 27:40). Luke omits the saying in both places but refers to it in Acts 6:14. John has a version of the saying in his account of the cleansing of the temple (John 2:19). The wide attestation of the saying has led many scholars to consider it an authentic word of Jesus. See Klostermann, p. 155; Lohmeyer, p. 327; Taylor, p. 566. Schweizer, Mark, p. 325, thinks that the temple saying may have formed the original charge at the trial. However, we have seen that it is a secondary insertion. See further, Lohse, History, p. 84.

[2]Gnilka, "Verhandlungen," p. 21; Juel, pp. 144-68.

[3]Juel, p. 155.

[4]Ibid., pp. 154-57.

[5]Ibid., p. 144.

questioning in vv. 60-61.[1] The temple saying fits in with the temple theme that has occupied Mark since Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem. In 11:11 Jesus goes into the temple and surveys everything. The next day he goes into the city and the temple, and he begins to expel the merchants and disrupt their business. The scene climaxes in the teaching of Jesus, "is it not written, 'My house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations'? But you have made it a robbers' den" (11:17). There is an attempt here to restore the original intention of God that the temple be a house of prayer for all nations, a universal place of worship. This is no longer possible because Israel has died. This is the meaning of the cursing of the fig tree (11:12-14; 20-25) which Mark uses to frame the cleansing of the temple. Israel has not borne fruit; it is cursed and found to be withered from its roots.[2] The importance of this passage for understanding the temple charge in the trial is obvious. The temple and the old religious order are no longer the context in which God is to be worshiped. The temple will be destroyed and a whole new order, the Christian community, will be built. It is also just possible that Mark is saying something about the difference in the type of worship found in the "temple made with hands" and the other temple "not made with hands." Although there is no polemic against the sacrificial system in the original text of Isa 56:7 which Mark quotes in 11:17,

---

[1]Klostermann, p. 155.

[2]Giesen, pp. 95-111.

Mark himself may have understood the text as an attack on the sacrificial system. In the pericope about the first two commandments (12:28-34) the scribe states that the twofold law of love is "more than all burnt-offerings and sacrifices" (v. 33). This criticism of the cult is put in the mouth of a Jewish scribe who is pictured as in agreement with Jesus that love takes precedence over the cult.[1] That Mark intends a contrast between the cult and prayer is shown by Jesus' interference in the temple trade which was connected with the cult and by the fact that Mark returns to the theme of prayer in 11:24-25.[2] Further background for the temple charge is the conclusion of the parable of the wicked tenants. Ps 118:22-23 is quoted: "Have you never read this scripture, 'This stone which the builders rejected has become the corner stone; this is from the Lord and it is wonderful in our eyes'?" Here the resurrection of Jesus is foretold in the context of a rejection of Israel and in the imagery of building. Again the importance of the passage for understanding the temple charge is obvious. In 13:1-2 Jesus predicts the destruction of the temple, and in the discourse that follows he brings this event into relationship with the events of the end-time. In the passion narrative itself there are two further references to the temple. In 15:29 the temple saying is repeated in a

---

[1]Günther Bornkamm, "Das Doppelgebot der Liebe," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, vol. 21, ed. Walther Eltester (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954), pp. 89-90.

[2]Juel, pp. 134-36.

taunt. The taunt refers back to 14:58 and contracts the saying.[1] The repetition of the saying in 15:29 underlines its importance for Mark and draws it into closer contact with the crucifixion. The final mention of the temple in Mark occurs immediately after Jesus' death, "And the curtain of the temple was torn in two from top to bottom" (15:38). There is some dispute as to which curtain is meant. Probably what is intended is the inner curtain before the holy of holies. The function of the curtain was to protect God's majesty from profane eyes. With Jesus' death God's majesty no longer dwells in the temple made by hands. From now on God is to be worshiped in the Christian community, the other temple not made with hands.[2] With the temple charge in the trial scene and the temple theme developed in the Jerusalem section and the passion, Mark has brought the foundation of the Christian community into direct relationship with the death and resurrection of Jesus. Jesus dies for making the good confession. His confession brings his own death and thereby causes the dissolution of the old religious order and the beginning of an entirely new one.

Mark has expanded the dialogue in vv. 61-62 by the addition of "the Son of the Blessed One" to the high priest's question and of the Son of Man saying to Jesus' answer. The addition of "the Son of the Blessed One" to the high priest's question is a further coordination of the titles "Christ" and

---

[1]Gnilka, "Verhandlungen," p. 18.

[2]Schenke, Der gekreuzigte Christus, p. 100; Strack-Billerbeck, vol. 1, pp. 1043-1046; for a different view see Juel, pp. 140-42.

"Son of God" in Mark. It gives added force to Jesus' affirmation in v. 62. Jesus is the Christ; he is also God's Son. His true dignity is here revealed. The title that God uses to address him at the baptism he here affirms openly. This addition of Mark prepares for the centurion's confession in 15:39 in which Jesus is confessed as God's Son. The title "Son of God" like the title "Christ" is brought into direct contact with the crucifixion. Jesus dies for confessing that he is the Christ, the Son of God. The meaning of these two titles comes from the cross. The addition of the Son of Man saying to Jesus' answer to the high priest's question has the form of a prophetic threat. Although the members of the Sanhedrin now sit in judgment of Jesus, they will see him as the Son of Man coming to judge them. The prophecy comes at the moment when Jesus is completely helpless in the power of his enemies. The hidden dignity contained in the title "Son of Man" is affirmed at the moment when the circumstances surrounding Jesus most negate it.

Two of the additions that Mark has made to the pre-Markan trial scene, the temple saying and the Son of Man saying, are prophetic. In connection with these prophecies Mark introduces a scene in 14:65 in which Jesus is mocked as prophet.[1]

Mark has created a new immediate context for the trial by dovetailing it with Peter's denial. With 14:53 Mark leads directly from the arrest to the trial preparations. Verse 54

---

[1]Juel, pp. 71-72.

interrupts this narrative thread to bring Peter into the courtyard of the high priest. Mark then follows with the trial (vv. 55-65) and then the denial (vv. 66-72). The reason for the dovetailing is that Mark wants to draw the trial and the denial into the closest possible temporal and spatial proximity. At the same time that Jesus is giving the confession that costs him his life, Peter is below in the courtyard denying that he even knows Jesus.[1] Peter falls into unbelief. He first denies that he was with Jesus (v. 68). Mark is concerned to show the presence of the disciples with Jesus. They are called to follow from the beginning (1:16-20). Their call is to be with Jesus (3:14). They are constantly with him. When they are sent out to preach (6:7-13), nothing can be told about Jesus until they are again with him (6:30). Mark fills up the intervening time with the account of the Baptist's death (6:14-29).[2] In denying that he was with Jesus (v. 68), Peter denies his own discipleship. He had followed all the way into the courtyard of the high priest (ἕως ἔσω εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, v. 54); he now withdraws outside into the forecourt (ἔξω εἰς τὸ προαύλιον, v. 68). He has abandoned his discipleship. There he again denies his discipleship (v. 70); and calling down a curse on himself,[3] he denies that he knows

---

[1]Schenke, Der gekreuzigte Christus, p. 15.

[2]Wim Burgers, "De Instelling van de Twaalf in het Evangelie van Marcus," ETL 36 (1960): 644-45.

[3]Pesch, "Verleugnung," pp. 61-62, n. 54; Kim E. Dewey, "Peter's Curse and Cursed Peter," The Passion in Mark: Studies on Mark 14-16, ed. Werner H. Kelber (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), p. 101, n. 19.

Jesus (v. 71). At the very moment when Jesus makes the good confession before the Sanhedrin, Peter denies that he knows Jesus, abandons his discipleship, and falls into unbelief.

Mark has further interpreted the trial before the Sanhedrin by creating a new macro context for it. He has developed the messianic secret so that it leads up to the trial. Who Jesus is is not publicly proclaimed before the trial. Jesus suppresses the demons' cries, forbids those who are cured to spread his fame, and silences the special revelation that the disciples receive. Now in the passion who Jesus is is revealed. The mystery that surrounds his person is now preserved by the circumstances of the passion. Jesus is the Christ, but he is a crucified Christ. He is the Son of God, but the full revelation of his sonship is the cross.

Conclusions

Markan redactional activity is extensive in the Caesarea Philippi episode. He has composed the first two sections completely (8:27-30; 31-33). In the third section (8:34-9:1) he has joined together six sayings to develop the theme of discipleship. Two of the sayings he selected from the tradition (vv. 36, 37), three he took over from Q and redacted (vv. 34, 35, 38), and one he composed freely (9:1).

The composition revolves around Jesus' question to the disciples, "But you, who do you say I am?" (8:29). To set the stage Jesus withdraws with the disciples to the north to the villages of Caesarea Philippi where they can be alone.

On the way Jesus asks the disciples who men say he is. This question is merely preliminary. The opinions of men do not adequately reflect who Jesus is; nor can the disciples be content to merely recount what others say. Jesus sharpens the question to force the disciples to make a commitment. He addresses them squarely with the question, "But you, who do you say I am?" Peter answers with the confession of Mark's community, "You are the Christ." Mark has drawn this confession from the pre-Markan trial narrative. The question of the high priest has become the confession of Peter. Peter affirms what Jesus affirms in his answer to the high priest.

After the confession Jesus immediately imposes silence on the disciples and begins to spell out the implications of the confession in the Son of Man saying. Peter rebukes him, showing that he has not understood the confession he has just made. Jesus orders him to get behind him, to become again a disciple. Jesus then goes on to spell out the conditions of discipleship. The way of the disciple is the way of the Son of Man, the way of the cross.

The pre-Markan passion narrative provided Mark with the traditional pericope of the Sanhedrin trial. The trial is centered on the witness motif. The Sanhedrin seeks witness against Jesus to put him to death. All efforts fail and Jesus becomes the witness the members of the Sanhedrin seek. The high priest's question announces the theme of the crucified Christ which dominates the passion narrative. It is taken over by Mark and expanded. Not only does the high priest ask if Jesus is the Christ; he asks if he is the Son of the

On the way Jesus asks the disciples who men say he is. This question is merely preliminary. The opinions of men do not adequately reflect who Jesus is; nor can the disciples be content to merely recount what others say. Jesus sharpens the question to force the disciples to make a commitment. He addresses them squarely with the question, "But you, who do you say I am?" Peter answers with the confession of Mark's community, "You are the Christ." Mark has drawn this confession from the pre-Markan trial narrative. The question of the high priest has become the confession of Peter. Peter affirms what Jesus affirms in his answer to the high priest.

After the confession Jesus immediately imposes silence on the disciples and begins to spell out the implications of the confession in the Son of Man saying. Peter rebukes him, showing that he has not understood the confession he has just made. Jesus orders him to get behind him, to become again a disciple. Jesus then goes on to spell out the conditions of discipleship. The way of the disciple is the way of the Son of Man, the way of the cross.

The pre-Markan passion narrative provided Mark with the traditional pericope of the Sanhedrin trial. The trial is centered on the witness motif. The Sanhedrin seeks witness against Jesus to put him to death. All efforts fail and Jesus becomes the witness the members of the Sanhedrin seek. The high priest's question announces the theme of the crucified Christ which dominates the passion narrative. It is taken over by Mark and expanded. Not only does the high priest ask if Jesus is the Christ; he asks if he is the Son of the

Blessed One. Jesus' affirmative answer is the complete confession. The messianic secret is disclosed; who Jesus is is revealed but only in the context of the passion. Jesus is the Christ as Peter confessed, but he is the crucified Christ. He is the Son of God, but this can only be confessed in the context of his death (15:39). Peter, confronted with the passion, renounces his discipleship, withdraws his confession, and denies that he knows Jesus.

CONCLUSION

There is a tension in Mark's gospel between the revelation of who Jesus is and the suppression of that revelation. This tension is developed in the first half of the gospel. The demons know who Jesus is, and their cries reveal him. Jesus silences them because they know him. The miracles also reveal who Jesus is, and it is for this reason that they also are suppressed. The witnesses are ordered not to relate what they have seen. Even Jesus' teaching conceals who he is. He teaches in parables so that those outside may not understand. The disciples are given the mystery of the kingdom of God, but they also show themselves to be completely lacking in understanding. What they fail to grasp is the mystery of Jesus' person. Despite Jesus' efforts to suppress the revelation of who he is, the question keeps surfacing.

There is an important shift in Mark's narrative at Caesarea Philippi. The question that Jesus has suppressed up to this point he now places on the agenda. He asks the disciples who men say he is. They answer with opinions drawn from the realm of the prophetic, John the Baptist, Elijah, one of the prophets. These opinions are immediately swept away by Jesus' further question, "But you, who do you say I am?" The whole first part of Mark's gospel is moving toward this question. Peter's answer, "You are the Christ," seems

to resolve the tension that has been building in the first half of the gospel. But Jesus once again suppresses the revelation with a command to silence, and he begins to teach clearly that the Son of Man must suffer many things, be rejected and killed, and rise after three days. This is the first great passion prediction. It sets in motion the second half of the gospel. Jesus' way will end on the cross in Jerusalem. It begins at Caesarea Philippi with the question who he is. The first half of the gospel leads up to Caesarea Philippi. The second half moves from Caesarea Philippi to the cross. At the center of the gospel stands the question, "But you, who do you say I am?"

Mark has drawn Peter's answer, "You are the Christ," from the high priest's question in the Sanhedrin trial. The trial also centers on Jesus' identity. The high priest's question "Are you the Christ...?" announces one of the major themes of the passion, the theme of the crucified Christ. Jesus is condemned to death for affirming the title. The crucifixion results from Jesus' answer, "I am." The meaning of the title is drawn from the cross. Jesus is the crucified Christ. By drawing Peter's confession from the high priest's question Mark has created two parallel confessional scenes. Peter confesses at Caesarea Philippi what Jesus confesses before the Sanhedrin. The difference is that Jesus fully accepts the title and the crucifixion. Peter shows immediately that he does not understand what he has said. In rejecting Jesus' way he rejects also the confession he has just made. He does not understand what it is to confess Jesus as the

Christ.

In his redaction of the Sanhedrin trial, Mark expands the high priest's question with the addition, "the Son of the Blessed One." He places the title "Son of God" in apposition to the title "Christ." The Son of God in Mark is an other-worldly figure. This is the title that the voice at the baptism and the Transfiguration applies to Jesus. The title is also used by the demons who are other-worldly and have other-worldly insight. This other-worldly figure is none other than Jesus of Nazareth. His sonship implies great dignity and profound obedience. On the one hand the Son of God is a heavenly light figure. On the other he is the last in the long line of persecuted and martyred prophets. He is God's only Son. Like Abraham's only son his life will be demanded of him. This he freely accepts, both in Gethsemane and in his answer to the high priest's question. As a result the full revelation of Jesus as the Son of God takes place on the cross. It is when he has died that he can be confessed as God's Son. Mark has anticipated the centurion's confession by expanding the high priest's question. He has combined in Jesus' answer both the confession of Peter, "You are the Christ," and the confession of the centurion, "Truly this man was God's Son." The disclosure of the messianic secret takes place in the passion. Who Jesus is can be revealed because the mystery of his person is now secured by the circumstances of the passion. When everything negates who Jesus is, then he affirms that he is the Christ, the Son of God.

UMI

Besides confessing himself as the Christ, the Son of God, Jesus also refers to himself with the self-designation, the Son of Man. This title also expresses the mystery of his person. His authority as Son of Man rivals the authority of God himself. But this authority is contested. The title expresses the great dignity of Jesus, but this dignity is hidden in his humanity. Jesus will come in glory as the Son of Man, but the title is not sufficient in itself to call up the eschatological glory. For this other qualifiers are needed. The title refers basically to the hidden dignity of Jesus. This is expressed above all in the passion predictions. The first one follows Peter's confession. It outlines the way of the Son of Man, a way that will lead to the cross and through the cross to the resurrection. This way is also the way of discipleship. To confess Jesus as the Christ, it is necessary to take up the cross and follow the way of the Son of Man.

All of this eludes the disciples. They do not understand the way of the cross; they do not understand the eschatological glory. Peter shows immediately that he does not understand the confession he has made. He does not know what it is to confess Jesus as the Christ. Confronted with the passion he withdraws his confession at the very moment that Jesus affirms it. In doing so he denies his own discipleship. Not even the resurrection will enlighten the disciples. The women flee in fear when they are given the message of the resurrection. They flee in unbelief, an unbelief that

has characterized the disciples throughout the gospel. Who Jesus is is a secret. The question that Jesus addresses the disciples, "But you, who do you say I am?," is radically unanswerable. All that remains is the renewed call to discipleship. Jesus will go before the disciples to Galilee. He will lead them back to the beginning. There they will once again hear his call to follow. There they will hear his teaching and witness his miracles. There they will be confronted again with the question, "But you, who do you say I am?" There they will once again set out on the way to Jerusalem.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Achtemeier, Paul J. "Toward the Isolation of Pre-Markan Miracle Catenae." Journal of Biblical Literature 89 (1970): 265-91.

Allegro, John M. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan. Vol. 5. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.

_____. "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrasim." Journal of Biblical Literature 77 (1958): 350-54.

_____. "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature." Journal of Biblical Literature 75 (1956): 174-87.

Ambrozic, Aloysius M. The Hidden Kingdom: A Redaction-Critical Study of the References to the Kingdom of God in Mark's Gospel. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, vol. 2. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1972.

Arens, Eduardo. The ΗΛΘΟΝ-Sayings in the Synoptic Tradition. Orbis biblicus et orientalis, vol. 10. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag, 1976.

Arndt, William F., and Gingrich, F. Wilbur. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1957.

Arnold, Gerhard. "Mk 1,1 und Eröffnungswendungen in griechischen und lateinischen Schriften." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 68 (1977): 123-27.

Bacon, Benjamin W. "Notes on New Testament Passages: I On the Aorist εὐδόκησα in Mark i.11 and Parallels." Journal of Biblical Literature 16 (1897): 136-39.

_____. "Supplementary Note on the Aorist εὐδόκησα, Mark i.11." Journal of Biblical Literature 20 (1901): 28-30.

Barrett, C. K. "The Background of Mark 10:45." New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester University, 1959. 1-18.

Barton, George A. "The Use of ἐπιτιμᾶν in Mark 8:30 and 3:12." Journal of Biblical Literature 41 (1922): 233-36.

Bauckham, Richard. "The Martyrdom of Enoch and Elijah: Jewish or Christian?" Journal of Biblical Literature 95 (1976): 447-58.

Bauer, Johannes B. "'Wer sein Leben retten will...': Mk 8,35 Parr." Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70.Geburtstag. Edited by J. Blinzler, O. Kuss, and F. Mussner. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1963. 7-10.

Bauernfeind, Otto. Die Worte der Dämonen im Markusevangelium Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, series 3, vol. 8. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1927.

Beardslee, William A. Literary Criticism of the New Testament. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970.

Beasley-Murray, G. R. "The Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." Journal of Theological Studies 48 (1947): 1-12.

Benoit, P., and Boismard, M.-E. Synopse des quatre évangiles en Francais. Vol. 2. Paris: Cerf, 1972.

Berger, Klaus. Die Auferstehung des Propheten und die Erhöhung des Menschensohnes: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Deutung des Geschickes Jesus in frühchristlichen Texten. Studien zur Unwelt des Neuen Testaments, vol. 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.

Bird, C. H. "Some γαρ Clauses in St. Mark's Gospel." Journal of Theological Studies 4 (1953): 171-87.

Blank, Josef. "Die Sendung des Sohnes: Zur christologischen Bedeutung des Gleichnisses von den bösen Winzern Mk 12, 1-12." Neues Testament und Kirche: Für Rudolf Schnackenburg. Edited by Joachim Gnilka. Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1974. 11-41.

Blass, F., and Debrunner, A. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk. Chicago and London: University of Chicago, 1961.

Bonner, Campbell. "Traces of Thaumaturgic Technique in the Miracles." Harvard Theological Review 20 (1927): 171-81.

Boobyer, G. H. "Mark II,10a and the Interpretation of the Healing of the Paralytic." Harvard Theological Review 47 (1954): 115-20.

Boring, M. Eugene. "The Paucity of Sayings in Mark: A Hypothesis." Society of Biblical Literature 1977 Seminar Papers. Edited by Paul J. Achtemeier. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1977. 371-77.

Bornkamm, Günther. "Das Doppelgebot der Liebe." Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, vol. 21. Edited by Walther Eltester. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954. 85-93.

Bornkamm, Günther; Barth, Gerhard; and Held, Heinz Joachim. Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. Translated by Percy Scott. London: SCM, 1963.

Borsch, Frederick Houk. The Christian and Gnostic Son of Man. Studies in Biblical Theology, second series, vol. 14. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1970.

_____. The Son of Man in Myth and History. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967.

Bratcher, Robert G. "A Note on υἱὸς θεοῦ (Mark xv.39)." Expository Times 68 (1956-57): 27-28.

Braumann, Georg. "Markus 15:2-5 und Markus 14:55-64." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 52 (1961): 273-78.

Brown, Raymond E. "J. Starcky's Theory of Qumran Messianic Development." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 28 (1966): 51-57.

Bultmann, Rudolf. The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Translated by John Marsh. New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1963.

Burger, Christoph. Jesus als Davidssohn: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, vol. 98. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.

Burgers, Wim. "De Instelling van de Twaalf in het Evangelie van Marcus." Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses 36 (1960): 625-54.

Burkill, T. A. "Mark 3:7-12 and the Alleged Dualism in the Evangelist's Miracle Material." Journal of Biblical Literature 87 (1968): 409-417.

_____. Mysterious Revelation: An Examination of the Philosophy of St. Mark's Gospel. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, 1963.

UMI

Burrows, Millar, ed. The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery. 2 vols. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950-51.

Buse, Ivor. "The Markan Account of the Baptism of Jesus and Isaiah LXIII." Journal of Theological Studies 7 (1956): 74-75.

Ceroke, Christian P. "Is Mark 2,10 a Saying of Jesus?" Catholic Biblical Quarterly 22 (1960): 369-90.

Colpe, Carston. "ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. 8. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1972. 400-477.

Colwell, E. C. "A Definite Rule for the Use of the Article in the Greek New Testament." Journal of Biblical Literature 52 (1933): 12-21.

Conzelmann, Hans. Der erste Brief an die Korinther. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, vol. 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.

_____. "Gegenwart und Zukunft in der synoptischen Tradition." Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 54 (1957): 277-96.

_____. The Theology of St. Luke. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.

Cooke, Gerald. "The Israelite King as Son of God." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 73 (1961): 202-225.

_____. "The Sons of (the) God(s)." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 76 (1964): 22-47.

Coppens, Joseph; and Dequeker, Luc. Le Fils de l'homme et les Saints du Très-Haut en Daniel, VII, dans les Apocryphes et dans le Nouveau Testament. Analecta lovaniensia biblica et orientalia, series 3, vol. 23. 2nd ed. Gembloux: Duculot, 1961.

Crossan, John Dominic. "The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen." Journal of Biblical Literature 90 (1971): 451-65.

Dahl, Nils Alstrup. "Der gekreuzigte Messias." Der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus: Beiträge zum Christusverständnis in Forschung und Verkündigung Edited by Helmut Ristow and Karl Matthiae. 2nd ed. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961. 149-69.

Dautzenberg, Gerhard. Sein Leben bewahren: Ψυχή in den Herrenworten der Evangelien. Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, vol. 14. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1966.

Dehandschutter, B. "La parabole des vignerons homicides (Mc.,XII,1-12) et l'évangile selon Thomas." L'évangile selon Marc: Tradition et rédaction. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium, vol. 34. Edited by M. Sabbe. Louvain: Leuven University, 1974. 203-219.

Denaux, A. "Petrusbelijdenis en eerste lijdensvoorspelling." Collationes brugenses et gandavenses 15 (1969): 188-220.

Descamps, A.-L. "Pour une histoire du titre 'Fils de Dieu': Les Antécédents par rapport à Marc." L'évangile selon Marc: Tradition et rédaction. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium, vol. 34. Edited by M. Sabbe. Louvain: Leuven University, 1974. 529-71.

Devisch, M. "La relation entre l'évangile de Marc et la document Q." L'évangile selon Marc: Tradition et rédaction. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium, vol. 34. Edited by M. Sabbe. Louvain: Leuven University, 1974. 59-91.

Dewey, Kim E. "Peter's Curse and Cursed Peter." The Passion in Mark: Studies on Mark 14-16. Edited by Werner H. Kelber. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976. 96-114.

Dibelius, Martin. From Tradition to Gospel. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.

Dinkler, Erich. "Jesu Wort vom Kreuztragen." Neutestamentlichen Studien für Rudolf Bultmann. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, vol. 21. Edited by Walther Eltester. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954. 110-130.

_____. "Petrusbekenntnis und Satanswort: Das Problem der Messianität Jesu." Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80.Geburtstag. Edited by Erich Dinkler with Hartwig Thyen. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964. 127-53.

Dobschütz, Ernst von. "Zur Erzählerkunst des Markus." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 27 (1928): 193-98.

Dodd, C. H. The Parables of the Kingdom. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961.

Donahue, John R. Are You the Christ? The Trial Narrative in the Gospel of Mark. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, vol. 10. Missoula, Montana: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.

Doudna, John Charles. The Greek of the Gospel of Mark. Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, vol. 12. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1961.

Ebeling, Hans Jürgen. Das Messiasgeheimnis und die Botschaft des Marcus-Evangelisten. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, vol. 19. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1939.

Egger, Wilhelm. Frohbotschaft und Lehre: Die Sammelberichte des Wirkens Jesu im Markusevangelium. Frankfurter theologische Studien, vol. 19. Frankfurt: Josef Knecht, 1976.

_____. "Die Verborgenheit Jesu in Mk 3,7-12." Biblica 50 (1969): 466-90.

Eissfeld, Otto. The Old Testament: An Introduction. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.

Engnell, Ivan. Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East. 2nd ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967.

Farmer, William R. The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis. New York: Macmillan, 1964.

Fascher, Erich. "Theologische Beobachtungen zu δεῖ." Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, vol. 21. Edited by Walther Eltester. Belrin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954. 228-54.

Feuillet, A. "Le bapteme de Jésus." Revue biblique 71 (1964): 321-52.

_____. "Le bapteme de Jésus d'apres l'évangile selon Saint Marc (1,9-11)." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 21 (1959): 468-90.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Aramaic 'Elect of God' Text from Qumran." Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971. 127-60.

_____. "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament." New Testament Studies 20 (1973-74): 382-407.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Son of David Tradition and Mt. 22: 41-46 and Parallels." Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971. 113-26.

_____. "'4Q Testimonia' and the New Testament." Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971. 59-89.

Fletcher, Donald R. "Condemned to Die: The Logion on Cross-Bearing: What Does it Mean?" Interpretation 18 (1964): 156-64.

Gero, Steven. "The Spirit as a Dove at the Baptism of Jesus." Novum Testamentum 18 (1976): 17-35.

Giesen, Heinz. "Der verdorrte Feigenbaum--Eine symbolische Aussage? Zu Mk 11,12-14.20f." Biblische Zeitschrift 20 (1976): 95-111.

Glasswell, Mark Errol. "The Use of Miracles in the Markan Gospel." Miracles: Cambridge Studies in their Philosophy and History. Edited by C. F. D. Moule. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1965. 149-62.

Gnilka, Joachim. "Das Elend vor dem Menschensohn (Mk 2,1-12)." Jesus und der Menschensohn: Für Anton Vögtle. Edited by Rudolf Pesch and Rudolf Schnackenburg with Odilo Kaiser. Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1975. 196-209.

_____. "Das Martyrium Johannes' des Täufers (Mk 6,17-29)." Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker. Edited by Paul Hoffmann with Norbert Brox and Wilhelm Pesch. Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1973. 78-92.

_____. "Die Verhandlungen vor den Synhedrion und vor Pilatus nach Markus 14,53-15,5." Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Vorarbeiten, vol. 2. Zurich, Einsiedeln, Cologne: Benziger, 1970. 5-21.

_____. Die Verstockung Israels: Isaias 6,9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker. Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, vol. 3. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1961.

Grässer, Erich. "Jesus in Nazareth (Mark VI.1-6a): Notes on the Redaction and Theology of St. Mark." New Testament Studies 16 (1969-70): 1-23.

Grundmann, Walter; Hesse, Franz; Jonge, Marinus de; and Woude, Adam Simon van der. "χρίω, χριστός, ἀντίχριστος, χρῖσμα, χριστιανός." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1974. 493-580.

Güttgemans, Erhard. "What is 'Generative Poetics'? Theses and Reflections Concerning a New Exegetical Method." Semeia 6 (1976): 1-21.

Guy, Harold A. "Son of God in Mk. 15:39." Expository Times 81 (1969-70): 151.

Haenchen, Ernst. "Die Komposition von Mk viii 27-ix 1 und Par." Novum Testamentum 6 (1963): 81-109.

_____. Der Weg Jesu: Eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1966.

Hahn, Ferdinand. The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity. Translated by Harold Knight and George Ogg. London: Lutterworth, 1969.

Harner, Philip B. "Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns: Mark 15:39 and John 1:1." Journal of Biblical Literature 92 (1973): 75-87.

Hawkin, David J. "The Incomprehension of the Disciples in the Markan Redaction." Journal of Biblical Literature 91 (1972): 491-500.

Hawkins, John C. Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1909.

Hay, David M. Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, vol. 18. Nashville and New York: Abingdon, 1973.

Hay, Lewis S. "Mark's Use of the Messianic Secret." Journal of the American Academy of Religion 35 (1967): 16-27.

_____. "The Son-of-God Christology in Mark." Journal of Bible and Religion 32 (1964): 106-114.

_____. "The Son of Man in Mark 2:10 and 2:28." Journal of Biblical Literature 89 (1970): 69-75.

Hengel, Martin. "Das Gleichnis von den Weingärtnern Mc 12, 1-12 im Lichte der Zenonpapyri und der rabbinischen Gleichnisse." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 59 (1968): 1-39.

_____. "Ist der Osterglauben noch zu retten?" Theologische Quartalschrift 153 (1973): 252-69.

Hengel, Martin. The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.

Higgins, Angus J. B. Jesus and the Son of Man. London: Lutterworth, 1964.

_____. "'Menschensohn' oder 'ich' in Q: Lk 12,8-9/Mt 10,32-33?" Jesus und der Menschensohn: Für Anton Vögtle. Edited by Rudolf Pesch and Rudolf Schnackenburg. Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1975. 117-23.

Hindley, J. C. "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch: An Historical Approach." New Testament Studies 14 (1967-68): 551-65.

Hoffmann, Paul. "Mk 8,31. Zur Herkunft und markinischen Rezeption einer alten Überlieferung." Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker. Edited by Paul Hoffmann with Norbert Brox and Wilhelm Pesch. Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1973. 170-204.

Hooker, Morna D. Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament. London: SPCK, 1959.

_____. The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the Term "Son of Man" and its Use in St. Mark's Gospel. London: SPCK, 1967.

Horst, P. W. van der. "Can a Book End with ΓΑΡ? A Note on Mark XVI.8." Journal of Theological Studies 23 (1972): 121-24.

Horstmann, Maria. Studien zur markinischen Christologie: Mk 8,27-9,13 als Zugang zum Christusbild des zweiten Evangeliums. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, n.s., vol. 6. 2nd ed. Münster: Aschendorff, 1973.

Hunkin, J. W. "'Pleonastic' ἄρχομαι in the New Testament." Journal of Theological Studies 25 (1923-24): 390-402.

Huntress, Erminie. "'Son of God' in Jewish Writings Prior to the Christian Era." Journal of Biblical Literature 54 (1935): 117-23.

Iersel, B. M. F. van. "Der Sohn" in den synoptischen Jesusworten: Christusbezeichnung der Gemeinde oder Selbstbezeichnung Jesu? Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.

Jeremias, Joachim. "Abba." Abba: Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966. 15-67.

UMI

Jeremias, Joachim. "Die älteste Schicht der Menschensohn-Logien." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 58 (1967): 159-72.

_____. The Parables of Jesus. Translated by S. H. Hooke. Rev. ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962.

Jonge, M. de. "The Use of the Word 'Anointed' in the Time of Jesus." Novum Testamentum 8 (1966): 132-48.

Juel, Donald. Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, vol. 31. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1977.

Keck, Leander E. "Mark 3:7-12 and Mark's Christology." Journal of Biblical Literature 84 (1965): 341-358.

_____. "The Spirit and the Dove." New Testament Studies 17 (1970-71): 41-67.

Kee, Howard Clark. Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977.

_____. "The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16." Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70.Geburtstag. Edited by E. Earle Ellis and Erich Grässer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975. 165-88.

_____. "Mark as Redactor and Theologian: A Survey of Some Recent Markan Studies." Journal of Biblical Literature 90 (1971): 333-36.

_____. "The Terminology of Mark's Exorcism Stories." New Testament Studies 14 (1967-68): 232-46.

_____. "The Transfiguration in Mark: Epiphany or Apocalyptic Vision?" Understanding the Sacred Text. Edited by John Reumann. Valley Forge: Judson, 1972. 135-52.

Kelber, Werner H. The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.

Kertelge, Karl. "Der dienende Menschensohn (Mk 10,45)." Jesus und der Menschensohn: Für Anton Vögtle. Edited by Rudolf Pesch and Rudolf Schnackenburg with Odilo Kaiser. Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1975. 225-39.

_____. "Die Vollmacht des Menschensohnes zur Sundenvergebung (Mk 2,10)." Orientierung an Jesu: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker. Edited by Paul Hoffmann with Norbert Brox and Wilhelm Pesch. Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1973. 205-213.

Kertelge, Karl. Die Wunder Jesu im Markusevangelium: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung. Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, vol. 23. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1970.

Kilpatrick, G. D. "The Order of Some Noun and Adjective Phrases in the New Testament." Novum Testamentum 5 (1962): 111-14.

_____. "Some Notes on Marcan Usage." The Bible Translator 7 (1956): 2-9, 51-56, 146.

Kleinknecht, Hermann; Rad, Gerhard von; Kuhn, Karl Georg; and Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. "βασιλεύς, βασιλεία, βασίλισσα, βασιλεύω, συμβασιλεύω, βασίλειος, βασιλικός." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. 1. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964. 564-93.

Klostermann, Erich. Das Markusevangelium. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, vol. 3. 5th ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1971.

Kramer, Werner. Christ, Lord, Son of God. Studies in Biblical Theology, vol. 50. Translated by Brian Hardy. London: SCM, 1966.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. "Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärtnern (Mk 12,1-9)." Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte: Gesammelte Aufsätze 1933-1964. Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 1965. 207-217.

_____. Introduction to the New Testament. Translated by A. J. Mattill, Jr. London: SCM, 1966.

_____. The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of Its Problems. Translated by S. McLean Gilmour and Howard C. Kee. Nashville and New York: Abingdon, 1972.

_____. "Das Verhalten Jesus gegenüber und das Verhalten des Menschensohns." Jesus und der Menschensohn: Für Anton Vögtle. Edited by Rudolf Pesch and Rudolf Schnackenburg with Odilo Kaiser. Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1975. 210-24.

Lagrange, M.-J. Evangile selon Saint Marc. Etudes bibliques. 5th ed. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1929.

Lambrecht, Jan. "The Christology of Mark." Biblical Theology Bulletin 3 (1973): 256-73.

UMI

Lambrecht, Jan. Marcus Interpretator: Stijl en Boodschap in Mc. 3,20-4,34. Brugge-Utrecht: Desclée de Brouwer, 1969.

_____. "Redaction and Theology in Mk., IV." L'évangile selon Marc: Tradition et rédaction. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium, vol. 34. Edited by M. Sabbe. Louvain: Leuven University, 1974. 269-307.

_____. Die Redaktion der Markus-Apokalypse: Literarische Analyse und Strukturuntersuchung. Analecta biblica, vol. 28. Rome: Päpstliches Bibelinstitut, 1967.

Lightfoot, R. H. The Gospel Message of St. Mark. London: Oxford University, 1950.

Lohmeyer, Ernst. Das Evangelium des Markus. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, vol. I-2. 17th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.

Lohse, Eduard. History of the Suffering and Death of Jesus Christ. Translated by Martin O. Dietrich. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.

_____. "Hosianna." Novum Testamentum 6 (1963): 113-19.

_____. "Jesu Worte über den Sabbat." Judentum--Urchristentum--Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, vol. 26. Edited by Walther Eltester. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1960. 79-89.

_____. "ὡσαννά." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. 9. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1974. 682-84.

Lövestam, Evald. Son and Saviour: A Study of Acts 13,32-37. Lund: G. W. K. Gleerup, 1961.

Luz, Ulrich. "Das Geheimnismotif und die markinische Christologie." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 56 (1965): 9-30.

Maisch, Ingrid. Die Heilung des Gelähmten: Eine exegetisch-traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Mk 2,1-12. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, vol. 52. Stuttgart: KBW, 1971.

Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. "Elements of an Exegesis of the Gospel of Mark According to Lévi-Strauss' Methodology." Society of Biblical Literature 1977 Seminar Papers. Edited by Paul J. Achtemeier. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1977. 155-70.

Marshall, I. Howard. "Son of God or Servant of Yahweh?--A Reconsideration of Mark I,11." New Testament Studies 15 (1968-69): 326-36.

_____. "The Synoptic Son of Man Sayings in Recent Discussion." New Testament Studies 12 (1965-66): 327-51.

Marxsen, Willi. Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel. Translated by James Boyce, Donald Juel, William Poehlmann with Roy A. Harrisville. New York: Abingdon, 1969.

Mauer, Christian. "Das Messiasgeheimnis des Markusevangeliums." New Testament Studies 14 (1967-68): 515-26.

McArthur, H. K. "Mark xiv.62." New Testament Studies 4 (1957-58): 156-58.

McCurley, Foster R., Jr. "'And After Six Days' (Mark 9:2): A Semitic Literary Device." Journal of Biblical Literature 93 (1974): 67-81.

Mead, Richard T. "The Healing of the Paralytic--A Unit?" Journal of Biblical Literature 80 (1961): 348-54.

Metzger, Bruce M. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. London and New York: United Bible Societies, 1971.

Michel, Otto; and Betz, Otto. "Von Gott gezeugt." Judentum--Urchristentum--Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, vol. 26. Edited by Walther Eltester. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1960. 3-23.

Minette de Tillesse, G. Le secret messianique dans l'Evangile de Marc. Lectio Divina, vol. 47. Paris: Cerf, 1968.

Moule, C. F. D. An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge Uniersity, 1963.

Neirynck, Frans. Duality in Mark: Contributions to the Study of the Markan Redaction. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium, vol. 31. Louvain: Leuven University, 1972.

Newell, Jane E.; and Newell, Raymond R. "The Parable of the Wicked Tenants." Novum Testamentum 14 (1972): 226-37.

Nineham, D. E. The Gospel of St. Mark. Pelican Gospel Commentaries. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963.

Norden, Eduard. Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede. Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1913.

Nützel, Johannes M. Die Verklärungserzählung im Markusevangelium: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung. Forschung zur Bibel, vol. 6. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1973.

_____. "Zum Schicksal der eschatologischen Propheten." Biblische Zeitschrift 20 (1976): 59-94.

Perrin, Norman. "The Christology of Mark." L'évangile selon Marc: Tradition et rédaction. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium, vol. 34. Edited by M. Sabbe. Louvain: Leuven University, 1974. 471-85.

_____. "The Composition of Mark ix 1." Novum Testamentum 11 (1969): 67-70.

_____. "The High Priest's Question and Jesus' Answer (Mark 14:61-62)." The Passion in Mark: Studies on Mark 14-16. Edited by Werner H. Kelber. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976. 80-95.

_____. "Mark xiv.62: The End Product of a Christian Pesher Tradition? New Testament Studies 12 (1965-66): 150-55.

_____. "Towards an Interpretation of the Gospel of Mark." Christology and a Modern Pilgrimage: A Discussion with Norman Perrin. Edited by Hans Dieter Betz. N.p.: New Testament Colloquium, 1971. 1-78.

_____. What is Redaction Criticism? Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.

_____. "The Use of (παρα)διδόναι in Connection with the Passion of Jesus in the New Testament." Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde. Edited by Eduard Lohse with Christoph Burchard and Berndt Schaller. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970. 204-212.

Pesch, Rudolf. "Anfang des Evangeliums Jesu Christi: Eine Studie zum Prolog des Markusevangeliums (Mk 1,1-15)." Der Zeit Jesu: Festschrift für Henrich Schlier. Edited by Günther Bornkamm and Karl Rahner. Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1970. 108-144.

_____. Der Besessene von Gerasa: Entstehung und Überlieferung einer Wundergeschichte. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, vol. 56. Stuttgart: KBW, 1972.

UMI

Pesch, Rudolf. "Zur Entstehung des Glaubens an die Auferstehung Jesu." Theologische Quartalschrift 153 (1973): 201-228.

_____. "Die Heilung der Schwiegermutter des Simon-Petrus: Ein Beispiel heutiger Synoptikerexegese." Neuere Exegese--Verlust oder Gewinn? Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1968. 143-75.

_____. Jesu ureigene Taten? Ein Beitrag zur Wunderfrage. Quaestiones disputatae, vol. 52. Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1970.

_____. "Das Messiasbekenntnis des Petrus (Mk 8,27-30): Neuverhandlung einer alten Frage." Biblische Zeitschrift 17 (1973): 178-95; 18 (1974): 20-31.

_____. Naherwartungen: Tradition und Redaktion in Mk 13. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1968.

_____. "'Eine neue Lehre aus Macht': Eine Studie zu Mk 1,21-28." Evangelieforschung: Ausgewählte Aufsätze deutscher Exegeten. Edited by Johannes B. Bauer. Graz, Vienna, Cologne: Styria, 1968. 241-76.

_____. "Die Passion des Menschensohnes: Eine Studie zu den Menschensohnworten der vormarkinischen Passionsgeschichte." Jesus und der Menschensohn: Für Anton Vögtle. Edited by Rudolf Pesch and Rudolf Schnackenburg with Odilo Kaiser. Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1975. 166-95.

_____. "Ein Tag vollmächtigen Wirkens Jesu in Kapharnaum (Mk 1,21-34.35-39)." Bibel und Leben 9 (1968): 114-28, 177-95, 261-77.

_____. "Die Verleugnung des Petrus: Eine Studie zu Mk 14,54.66-72 (und Mk 14,26-31)." Neues Testament und Kirche: Für Rudolf Schnackenburg. Edited by Joachim Gnilka. Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1974. 42-62.

Peterson, Erik. ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ: Epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, n.s., vol. 24. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926.

Potterie, I. de la. "De compositione evangelii Marci." Verbum domini 44 (1966): 135-41.

Quesnell, Quinton. The Mind of Mark: Interpretation and Method through the Exegesis of Mark 6,52. Analecta biblica, vol. 38. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.

Rad, Garhard von; Kuhn, Karl Georg; and Gutbrod, Walter. "Ἰσραήλ, Ἰσραηλίτης, Ἰουδαῖος, Ἰουδαία, Ἰουδαικός, Ἰουδαΐζω, Ἰουδαισμός, Ἑβραῖος, Ἑβραικός, ἑβραΐς, ἑβραιστί." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. 3. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1965. 356-91.

Rahlfs, Alfred. Septuaginta. 2 vols. 9th ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1971.

Reploh, Karl-Georg. Markus--Lehrer der Gemeinde: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Jüngerperikopen des Markus-Evangeliums. Stuttgarter biblische Monographien, vol. 9. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1969.

Richter, Georg. "Zu den Tauferzählungen Mk 1,9-11 und Joh 1,32-34." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 65 (1974): 43-56.

Riesenfeld, Harald. "The Meaning of the Verb ἀρνεῖσθαι." Coniectanea Neotestamentica 11 (1947): 207-219.

Ringgren, Helmer. The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Translated by Emilie T. Sander. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963.

Robbins, Vernon K. "Dynameis and Semeia in Mark." Biblical Research 18 (1973): 5-20.

_____. "The Healing of the Blind Bartimaeus (10:46-52) in the Marcan Theology." Journal of Biblical Literature 92 (1973): 224-43.

Rohde, Joachim. Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968.

Rost, Leonhard. "Zur Deutung des Menschensohnes in Daniel 7." Gott und die Götter: Festgabe für Erich Fascher zum 60.Geburtstag. Edited by Gerhard Delling. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1958. 41-43.

Ruppert, Lothar. Jesus als der leidende Gerechte? Der Weg Jesu im Lichte alt- und zwischentestamentlichen Motifs. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, vol. 59. Stuttgart: KBW, 1972.

Schenk, Wolfgang. Der Passionsbericht nach Markus: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Passionstradition. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1974.

Schenke, Ludger. Auferstehungsverkündigung und leeres Grab: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung von Mk 16,1-8. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, vol. 33. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1968.

_____. Der gekreuzigte Christus: Versuch eine literarkritischen und traditionsgeschichtlichen Bestimmung der vormarkinischen Passionsgeschichte. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, vol. 69. Stuttgart: KBW, 1974.

_____. Studien zur Passionsgeschichte des Markus: Tradition und Redaktion in Markus 14,1-42. Forschung zur Bibel, vol. 4. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1971.

Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung. Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1919.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. "'Das Evangelium' im Verständnis des ältesten Evangelisten." Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker. Edited by Paul Hoffmann with Norbert Brox and Wilhelm Pesch. Fribourg, Basel, Vienna: Herder, 1973. 309-324.

_____. "Mk 9,33-50." Synoptische Studien. Munich: Karl Zink, 1953. 184-206.

Scott, R. B. Y. "Behold, He Cometh with Clouds." New Testament Studies 5 (1958-59): 127-32.

Schweizer, Eduard. "Anmerkungen zur Theologie des Markus." Neotestamentica: German and English Essays 1951-1963. Zürich and Stuttgart: Zwingli, 1963. 93-104.

_____. "'Er wird Nazoräer heissen,' zu Mc. 1,24; Mt. 2,23." Neotestamentica: German and English Essays 1951-1963. Zürich and Stuttgart: Zwingli, 1963. 51-55.

_____. "Zur Frage des Messiasgeheimnisses bei Markus." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 56 (1965): 1-8.

_____. The Good News According to Mark. Translated by Donald H. Madwig. Atlanta: John Knox, 1970.

_____. "Der Menschensohn." Neotestamentica: German and English Essays 1951-1963. Zürich and Stuttgart: Zwingli, 1963. 56-84.

Scroggs, Robin. The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966.

Sharman, Henry Burton. Son of Man and Kingdom of God: A Critical Study. New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1943.

Sjöberg, Erik. Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch. Acta Reg. Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis, vol. 41. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946.

_____. Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien. Acta Reg. Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis, vol. 53. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1955.

Snodgrass, K. R. "The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen: Is The Gospel of Thomas Version the Original?" New Testament Studies 21 (1974-75): 142-44.

Snoy, Thierry. "Les miracles dans l'évangile de Marc: Examen de quelques études récentes." Revue théologique de Louvain 3 (1972): 449-62; 4 (1973): 58-101.

_____. "La rédaction marcienne de la marche sur les eaux (Mc.,VI,45-52)." Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses 44 (1968): 205-241, 433-81.

Souter, A. "ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ." Journal of Theological Studies 28 (1926-27): 59-60.

Starcky, J. "Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumran." Revue biblique 70 (1963): 481-505.

Stein, Robert H. "A Short Note on Mark xiv.28 and xvi.7." New Testament Studies 20 (1974): 445-52.

Strack, Herman L.; and Billerbeck, Paul. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. 6 vols. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1922-1961.

Strecker, Georg. "Literarkritische Überlegungen zum εὐαγγέλιον-Begriff im Markusevangelium." Neues Testament und Geschichte. Edited by Heinrich Baltensweiler and Bo Reicke. Zürich: Theologische Verlag, 1972. 91-104.

_____. "Zur Messiasgeheimnistheorie im Markusevangelium." Studia Evangelica, vol. 3. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, vol. 88. Edited by F. L. Cross. Berlin: Akademie, 1964. 87-104.

_____. "The Passion- and Resurrection Predictions in Mark's Gospel (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:32-34)." Interpretation 22 (1968): 421-42.

_____. "William Wrede." Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 57 (1960): 67-91.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. Das paulinische Evangelium: I. Vorgeschichte. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, vol. 96. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.

UMI

Suhl, Alfred. Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965.

Sukenik, E. L., ed. The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University. Jerusalem: Magnes Press & Hebrew University, 1955.

Taylor, Vincent. The Gospel According to Mark. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1966.

Tödt, Heinz E. The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.

Turner, C. H. "Marcan Usage: Notes, Critical and Exegetical, on the Second Gospel." Journal of Theological Studies 25 (1923-24): 377-86; 26 (1924-25): 12-20, 145-56, 225-40, 337-46; 27 (1925-26): 58-62; 28 (1926-27): 9-30, 349-62; 29 (1927-28): 275-89, 346-61.

_____. "ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ." Journal of Theological Studies 28 (1926-27): 362.

_____. "Ο ΥΙΟΣ ΜΟΥ Ο ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ." Journal of Theological Studies 27 (1925-26): 113-29.

Unnik, W. C. van. "Jesu Verhöhnung vor den Synedrium (Mc 14,65 par)." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 29 (1930): 310-11.

Vermes, Geza. "Appendix E: The Use of bar nas/bar nasa in Jewish Aramaic." An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, by Matthew Black. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967. 310-28.

Vielhauer, Philipp. "Erwägungen zur Christologie des Markusevangeliums." Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80.Geburtstag. Edited by Erich Dinkler with Hartwig Thyen. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964. 155-69.

_____. "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu." Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament. Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1965. 55-91.

Villalón, José R. "Sources vétéro-testamentaires de la doctrine Qumranienne des deux messies." Revue de Qumran 8 (1972-75): 53-63.

Vögtle, Anton. "Messiasbekenntnis und Petrusverheissung: Zur Komposition Mt 16,13-23 par." Biblische Zeitschrift 1 (1957): 252-72; 2 (1958): 85-103.

Vögtle, Anton. "Die sogennante Taufperikope Mk 1,9-11: Zur Problematik der Herkunft und des ursprünglichen Sinns." Evangelisch-Katholische Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Vorarbeiten, vol. 4.. Zürich: Benziger, 1972. 105-139.

Waetjen, Herman. "The Ending of Mark and the Gospel's Shift in Eschatology." Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute 4 (1965): 114-31.

Walter, Nikolaus. "Zur Analyse von Mc 10,17-31." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 53 (1962): 206-218.

Wcela, Emil A. "The Messiah(s) of Qumran." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 26 (1964): 340-49.

Weeden, Theodore J. "The Heresy that Necessitated Mark's Gospel." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 59 (1968): 145-58.

_____. Mark--Traditions in Conflict. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.

Weiss, Konrad. "Ekklesiologie, Tradition und Geschichte in der Jüngerunterweisung Mark 8,27-10,52." Der historische Jesus und die kerygmatische Christus. Edited by Helmut Ristow and Karl Matthiae. 2nd ed. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961. 414-38.

Wendling, Emil. Die Entstehung des Markus-Evangeliums: Philologische Untersuchungen. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1908.

Wilder, Amos N. Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel. London: SCM, 1964.

Wittig, Susan. "Meaning and Modes of Signification: Toward a Semiotic of the Parable." Semiology and Parables: An Exploration of the Possibilities Offered by Structuralism for Exegesis. Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series, vol. 9. Edited by Daniel Patte. Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1976. 319-47.

Wood, J. Edwin. "Isaac Typology in the New Testament." New Testament Studies 14 (1967-68): 583-89.

Wrede, William. The Messianic Secret. Translated by J. C. G. Grieg. Greenwood, S.C.: Attic, 1971.

Wülfing von Martitz, Peter; Fohrer, Georg; Schweizer, Eduard; Lohse, Eduard; and Schneemelcher, Wilhelm. "υἱός, υἱοθεσία." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1972. 334-99.

Zerwick, Max. Untersuchungen zum Markus-Stil: Ein Beitrag zur stilistischen Durcharbeitung des Neuen Testaments. Scripta pontificii instituti biblici. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1937.

Zimmerli, W; and Jeremias, J. The Servant of God. Studies in Biblical Theology, vol. 20. London: SCM, 1957.

Zimmermann, Heinrich. Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre: Darstellung der historisch-kritischen Methode. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Kath. Bibelwerk, 1968.